Item No. 9

By: **Graham Gibbens: Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Supporting Independence**
Pete Raine: Managing Director: Environment and Regeneration

To: **County Council**

Date: **25th May 2006**

Subject: **Kent and Medway Structure Plan: Progress Report and Adoption of the Plan**

Summary:

This report summarises the position reached with preparation of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan, the responses received to recent public consultation on further modifications and recommends that the remaining procedural steps leading to adoption of the Plan be initiated.

Background

1. Preparation of a new Structure Plan (the Kent and Medway Structure Plan), forming the strategic arm of the statutory Development Plan for Kent, is entering its final stage. The Plan is the joint responsibility of Kent County Council and Medway Council.

2. The 'deposit' version of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan was published in September 2003. Following extensive public consultation and consideration of representations received on the draft plan, Kent and Medway Councils agreed a set of 'Proposed Changes' to the Plan which were published for consultation in June 2004 prior to the Structure Plan's public inquiry [Examination in Public (EIP)]. The EIP, conducted by an independent Panel appointed by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State, was held over a 4-week period in September 2004.

3. The Panel's report was submitted to the Councils in February 2005. It summarised the main issues debated at the EIP and set out their conclusions and recommendations. The Councils published their formal response to the recommendations of the EIP Panel, and consequent Proposed Modifications to the Plan, for consultation during September/October 2005.

4. Following assessment of the responses received to this consultation officers recommended that it would not be appropriate or judicious to proceed to final adoption of the Plan, as originally intended at this stage, without consideration of a further round of limited modifications. This arose primarily from outstanding objections from Government concerning modifications to two of the housing policies of the Plan (Policy HP1 -in respect of Swale, Maidstone and Medway and Policy HP2a - Housing Provision: Phasing, Assessment and Sequential Approach to Location). The opportunity was also taken to include some other minor changes to the Plan that would further aid clarity and presentation. In total 12 further modifications were proposed.

Consultation on the Further Proposed Modifications

5. Consultation on the Further Proposed Modifications took place between January 5th and February 16th 2006. Approximately 2,800 consultees were sent a copy of the consultation document. Almost 100 respondents submitted nearly 150 individual comments. Nearly half of all responses received were objections to FPMOD 3.1 (Policy NK3: Swale – Kent Science Park) and FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1: Housing Provision and Distribution 2001 - 2016).

6. There were also nearly 40 comments received which are considered to be 'not valid' as they do not directly relate to the specific changes being consulted upon as required by the relevant regulations at this stage of Structure Plan preparation.

7. Members will wish to note in particular that no objections were received from Government to the Further Proposed Modifications.

8. A detailed summary of all representations received, together with a draft response on behalf of the Councils and a list of respondents is contained in *the "Report of Consultation on the Further Proposed Modifications"* (Annex 1 to this report) **(copies can be found on the Committee & Member Information webpage at www.kent.gov.uk or obtained from Mary Cooper, Legal & Democratic Services, Room 1.99, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone).**

Policy NK3 – Swale – Kent Science Park

9. FPMOD 3.1 involves the clarification of terminology referring to the Kent Science Park (KSP) near Sittingbourne. It proposes that reference to KSP be as a '*technology and knowledge based cluster'* as opposed to a '*science based cluster*'. This was to ensure compatible terminology between this policy and Policy FP4 of the Structure Plan on Technology and Knowledge Based Clusters which includes Kent Science Park. The majority of objections received on this modification were of a similar format, and raised concerns that omitting the word 'science' from the policy would downgrade aspirations for a 'true' science park at KSP and allow it to become a general industrial/business park.

10. The EIP Panel confirmed the designation of Kent Science Park as a technology and knowledge cluster and in this context it is both logical and appropriate to adopt common terminology in the Plan's policy references to Kent Science Park. The revised terminology does not alter policy objectives to extend and enhance the kernel of high value added, science based, activity that is the rationale for the designation of this location as a cluster. No further changes are proposed.

Policy HP1 – Swale

11. The majority of objections to FPMOD 7.1 related to the proposed increase in the housing provision figure by a further 800 dwellings for Swale for the period 2001 to 2016 (i.e. from 8,300 to 9,100 dwellings). This modification was proposed due to objections received at the Proposed Modifications stage, particularly from Government, that the Councils had responded insufficiently to the recommendation of the EIP Panel for a substantial increase in the housing provision for Swale. The EIP Panel had recommended an increase of 2200 dwellings compared with a total increase of 1600 proposed by the Councils (800 in each round of the modifications).

12. Swale BC object to the further increase maintaining that the EIP Panel's recommendation was 'seriously flawed' and misunderstood the nature of housing land supply in Swale. The Borough Council is also concerned at the reliance placed by Government and others on the non-statutory Inter Regional Planning statement for Thames Gateway. They also object in view of the implications for the balance between employment and housing in Swale.

13. A number of other objections submitted in a similar format, expressed concern that the additional homes cannot be accommodated without identifying further greenfield land for development.

14. Other objections were made on the grounds that the proposed increase in housing for Swale is not high enough given the EIP Panel recommendation.

15. The further modification for Swale was accepted by the Councils to meet the concerns of objectors following the first round of modifications – principally those of Government. This was done with some reluctance given the Councils' initial response to the EIP Panel recommendation and recognition of the pressure that would be exerted on the need for additional greenfield housing land supply. This modification remains a necessary step if the whole Structure Plan is to be adopted within the necessary timetable (see para 27 below) and if the benefits of the updated policies are to be achieved. There are no new circumstances or new matters raised in the representations that warrant any further changes on this aspect of the Plan. No further changes are proposed.

Policy HP1 – Maidstone
Policy HP1 – Medway

16. Further modifications were proposed adding explanatory footnotes to Policy HP1 in respect of Maidstone and Medway, in response to objections received to the Proposed Modifications, again, principally from Government.

FPMOD 7.1 MA – this modification added a footnote that the housing quantity for Maidstone is a minimum and that any increase above it will be governed by study of urban capacity and identification of sustainably located sites through Local Development Document preparation.

FPMOD 7.1 ME added a footnote indicating that the housing quantity for Medway reflects the scale of development expected by 2016 given the complexity of key urban regeneration sites and the development programme for Chattenden/Lodge Hill and that consideration would be given to a higher rate of development on these sites if proved feasible. This would be subject to the provision of necessary infrastructure and services in accordance with an agreed development strategy.

17. These modifications have been the subject of some representations. In the case of *Maidstone* these reflect concern that the change would weaken the status of the Policy HP1 housing quantity in guiding the future volume and pattern of housing development and that it was inconsistent to single out Maidstone with a reference to its housing quantity being 'a minimum'. These points were acknowledged by the Councils in their initial response to the EIP Panel report and were considered afresh in reluctantly accepting the further modification. No further change is proposed.

18. In respect of *Medway* one representation felt that the policy footnote should reflect the concern of the EIP Panel that if Chattenden/Lodge Hill (a major development location identified by the Structure Plan) failed to come forward when

necessary, alternative land should be identified. This point has been acknowledged by the Councils and is already reflected in changes made elsewhere in the Plan to the area policy for Medway (Policy NK2) in the first round of modifications. No further change is proposed.

Policy HP2a (Housing Provision: Phasing, Assessment and Sequential Approach to Location).

19. One representation maintains that the further change proposed to this policy remains inconsistent with the sequential approach to locating housing development contained in national planning policy guidance (PPG3) – particularly the degree of priority that should attach to urban extensions. This is not accepted – significant changes have been made to this policy through both rounds of modifications to clarify the application of the sequential approach in the circumstances of Kent and the settlement hierarchy that the Structure Plan identifies. No further change is proposed.

Other Modifications

20. Three other modifications were subject to a handful of objections:

- *FPMOD 4.1(Policy E8: Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity).*
  This modification rectifies an omission from the Proposed Modifications following acceptance of EIP Panel Recommendation R7.14.
- *FPMOD 6.3 (Policy FP14: Sequential Consideration of Sites for Retail and Leisure Development).*
  The modification removes the word 'exceptionally' from the policy following comment by the EIP Panel .If retained this would introduce more qualification to the treatment of large out of centre retail stores than is found in national guidance.
- *FPMOD 8.4 (Policy TP7 & Table TP7: Future Strategic Transport Schemes).*
  The modification reinstates the reference included in the original deposit plan that certain schemes may be funded partially or fully by development. It also clarifies the differing funding sections of the Sittingbourne Northern Distributor Road.

No further changes are felt to be warranted as a result of these representations.

21. The remaining (6) further modifications received no objections:

- *FPMOD 5.1 (Policy QL19: Strategic Green Space Initiatives).* This responded to representations received to the Proposed Modifications and clarified the common character and function of major green space initiatives in the Kent Thames Gateway and East Kent.

- *FPMOD 6.1 (Policy FP10: Tourism Development and Regeneration) / FPMOD 6.2 (Policy FP11: Tourist Accommodation)*- both modified to refer to the hierarchy of strategic centres and the part of the Plan setting out this hierarchy.

- *FPMOD 8.1 (Policy TP3 & Table TP3: Safeguarding of Programmed Strategic Transport Schemes)* modified to clarify the differing funding positions of sections of the Sittingbourne Northern Distributor Road.

- *FPMOD 8.2 (Policy TP4: Support for Strategic Rail Schemes)* factual modification to reflect the abolition of the Strategic Rail Authority.

- *FPMOD 8.3 ((Policy TP5 & Table TP5: Major Transport Corridors)* -modified to correct an omission in respect of the full extent of the A21 corridor in Kent.

Next Steps

22. There is nothing within the representations received that officers and the Joint Advisory Board of Kent and Medway Members consider require further modifications to be made. On this basis the Councils should now proceed to adoption of the Plan.

23. In the absence of any further modifications to the Plan, and subject to no intervention or direction from the First Secretary of State requiring changes to the Plan, the remaining stages of leading to adoption are:

- Publication of a statement of the Councils' response to the representations received to the Further Proposed Modifications (the *"Report of Consultation on the Further Proposed Modifications"*);
- Publication of a statutory notice (28 day notice period) of the Councils' intention to adopt the Plan alongside the policies and proposals proposed for adoption;
- Publication of a further statutory notice confirming the formal adoption of the Plan. A six-week period follows for any legal challenges to be submitted;
- Following this six week period, and subject to there being no legal challenge, publication of the adopted version of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan.

24. Adoption of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan is ultimately a matter for the full Councils of Kent and Medway. At its meeting in April the Kent and Medway Joint Structure Plan Advisory Board commended adoption of the Plan to the Councils.

25. On April 20th Medway Council resolved to proceed to adoption of the Plan and agreed the detailed recommendations contained in this report.

26. Following consideration by the two Councils a summary of the timetable envisaged for the remaining statutory procedures is set out below:

Kent County Council : Consideration of resolution to Adopt the Kent and Medway Structure Plan	**May 25th 2006**
Publish Statutory Notice of Intention to Adopt the Plan	**Early June 2006**
End of 28 day notice period	Early July 2006
Publish Statutory Notice of Adoption (Formal Adoption of the Plan)	**Early July 2006**
Six week period for legal challenge	Early July – Mid August 2006
Publication of adopted Structure Plan	September 2006

27. It is most important that adoption procedures for the Structure Plan are progressed as expeditiously as possible. Members will wish to note that the Plan must reach formal adoption by 21 July 2006. At this point the formal requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations 2004 become applicable to

plans, such as the Structure Plan, which commenced preparation prior to July 2004. The above timetable is extremely tight in this regard but will allow adoption of the Plan prior to this date.

28. Once adopted, the Plan will remain in force until the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS - the South East Plan) has been issued in its final form by Government. The RSS was submitted to Government by SEERA at the end of March, but has to progress through a number of further stages before being finalised by Government. This includes a further round of public consultation and a Public Examination to be held in Winter 2006/7. Publication of the RSS in its final form is not expected before Spring 2008 at the earliest. It would only be at this point that the Structure Plan would be overtaken by the RSS. The Structure Plan has already been a major influence on the draft South East Plan and in particular the sub regional policies applying to Kent for the longer term to 2026. In considering planning applications and local planning proposals between now and the adoption of the South East Plan, the Structure Plan will be the statutory strategy for the County.

The Plan for Adoption

29. At present the Plan consists of the original deposit draft of September 2003 and the two sets of modifications published by Kent and Medway Councils in September 2005 and January 2006 respectively. In conjunction with its adoption the Plan's policies and proposals need to be consolidated and the supporting text revised and updated.

30. The Kent and Medway Structure Plan consists of:

- A Written Statement of the Plan's policies and proposals
- A Key Diagram – illustrating the general policies formulated in the Plan
- An Explanatory Memorandum (supporting text)

Statutory weight and force applies to the formal Structure Plan i.e. the policies and Key Diagram. The Explanatory Memorandum provides an explanation of the reasoning and justification underlying the policies and proposals of the Plan.

31. In the absence of any further proposals to modify the Structure Plan the policies of the Plan are now fixed having been the subject of extensive consultation at a number of stages and scrutiny and testing through the Examination in Public (EIP). The Councils have previously endorsed the policies as they now stand.

32. The consolidated policies of the KMSP, together with a revised Key Diagram accompany this report (Annex 3). The Explanatory Memorandum has not been revised since publication of the Deposit Plan in September 2003. Revision of the Explanatory Memorandum reflects a number of considerations:

- The changes made to the policies including policies introduced, deleted or amalgamated as the Plan has progressed;
- Changes to the supporting text agreed by the Councils in responding to objections and representations received following consultation on the Deposit Plan;
- Changes to the content or order of the supporting text recommended by the EIP Panel in their report to the Councils in 2005 and accepted by them;
- Necessary updating to reflect changes in national or regional guidance or other contextual information;

- Other changes to improve the clarity of the supporting text.

33. The redrafted Plan follows the same sequence of topics as the original Deposit Plan although certain chapters have been re-titled – primarily in response to EIP Panel recommendations. However very substantial renumbering of policies has proved necessary as a consequence of:

- the introduction of new policies e.g. in respect of overall economic development strategy (Chapter 6) and promoting prudent use of resources (Chapter 9);
- deletion or relocation of polices between chapters and the renaming of chapters e.g. policies (FP) in the former Fostering Prosperity Chapter now become (EP) policies following the renaming of Chapter 6 as Employment and Prosperity.

To assist Members a schedule reconciling former and current policy numbers accompanies this report (see Annex 2).) **(copies can be found on the Committee & Member Information webpage at www.kent.gov.uk or obtained from Mary Cooper, Legal & Democratic Services, Room 1.99, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone).**
This will be issued at the time of plan adoption to assist users.

34. Whilst the Councils have discretion as to the content of the Explanatory Memorandum this must maintain consistency with the content and direction of the Plan's policies as they now stand.

35. When published following formal adoption the text and policies of the Structure Plan will be illustrated with maps, diagrams and charts in a manner similar to that used at the deposit stage of the Plan.

36. A revised draft Explanatory Memorandum (EM), integrated with the consolidated policies of the KMSP has been placed in the Members Room. Work continues on one aspect of the EM – namely the revised framework of monitoring indicators and targets (Table IM1) forming part of Chapter 11 on Implementing the Structure Plan and Monitoring its Effectiveness. This redrafting aims to take account of the potential for integration with monitoring for other Council strategies and related plans /strategies e.g. the regional plan and Local Development Frameworks. It is proposed that this element of the Explanatory Memorandum be confirmed following consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders from Kent and Medway Councils and the Chairman of the Joint Structure Plan Advisory Board.

Recommendations:

37. It is recommended that the County Council:

(i) endorse the draft '*Report of Consultation on the Further Proposed Modifications to the Kent and Medway Structure Plan'*, including the proposed response on behalf of the Councils, to the representations received on them (Annex 1 to this report) and agree its publication alongside the adoption procedures for the Structure Plan;
(ii) resolve that no further changes (modifications) be proposed to the policies of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan;
(iii) resolve that statutory notification of the intention to adopt the Kent and Medway Structure Plan be published at the earliest opportunity;

(iv) resolve that statutory notification of adoption of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan be published at the earliest opportunity following completion of the notification period for the intention to adopt;

(v) resolve that following (iv) the Kent and Medway Structure Plan is adopted as part of the development plan for Kent and Medway for the purposes of plan preparation and development control;

note the consolidated policies and Key Diagram for the Kent and Medway Structure Plan (Annex 3 to this report)) **(copies can be found on the Committee & Member Information webpage at www.kent.gov.uk or obtained from Mary Cooper, Legal & Democratic Services, Room 1.99, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone).**

(vi) and the draft revised Explanatory Memorandum, as the basis for the adopted Plan;

(vii) authorise officers of Kent and Medway Councils to make editorial changes of a minor nature to the draft Explanatory Memorandum prior to its publication, following adoption of the Plan;

(viii) resolve that the policies and supporting explanatory text to the Kent and Medway Structure Plan be published in printed form and deposited on the Structure Plan web site;

(ix) inform the public and partner organisations, through publicity and other means, of the importance, purpose and impact of the Structure Plan as current statutory policy for the future of Kent and Medway.

Background Documents

- *Kent and Medway Structure Plan: Deposit Plan (September 2003)*
- *Kent and Medway Structure Plan : Examination in Public : Panel Report (February 2005)*
- *Kent and Medway Structure Plan: Proposed Modifications (September 2005)*
- *Kent and Medway Structure Plan: Report of Consultation on the Proposed Modifications (December 2005)*
- *Kent and Medway Structure Plan : Further Proposed Modifications (January 2006)*
- *Kent and Medway Structure Plan : Consolidated policies and draft revised Explanatory Memorandum (April 2006)*

Officer Contact:

Dick Feasey, Planning Policy Manager:
Strategy and Planning Division
Environment and Regeneration Directorate
Tel: (01622) 221611
Email: dick.feasey@kent.gov.uk

County Council May 25th : Item

Kent and Medway Structure Plan
Further Proposed Modifications Consultation

5 January to 16 February 2006

Report of Consultation
on the
Further Proposed Modifications

May 2006

DRAFT

Summary of Consultation

The six week formal consultation period on the Further Proposed Modifications to the Kent and Medway Structure Plan was held between Thursday 5 January and Thursday 16 February 2006.

Approximately 2,800 consultees were sent a copy of the "Further Proposed Modifications" consultation document containing a copy of the formal public notice, the Further Proposed Modifications, and a response form.

The consultation document was also made available, free of charge, on request. It was placed on the web at www.kmsp.org.uk, displayed at all district council planning receptions, and at all libraries in Kent and Medway. In addition, a formal public notice was placed in Kent Messenger Group Newspapers covering Kent and Medway, as well as the Sevenoaks Chronicle and Tonbridge Courier, for two consecutive weeks (weeks ending 6 and 13 January 2006).

Consultation Results

All comments received up to the end of Friday 17 February (to allow for any postal delays) have been logged and recorded. Any comments received after this date have not been accepted as "duly made".

The total number of respondents amounted to 96.

A total of 143 valid individual comments were received relating to the Further Proposed Modifications. Out of these, 46 were in support, while 97 objected.

The Modifications attracting the highest number of objections were FPMOD 3.1 (Policy NK3) and FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1 – relating in particular to Swale). Together, objections to these two Further Proposed Modifications amounted to nearly half of all the responses received.

The table overleaf shows a breakdown of these comments.

Summary of Number of Responses Received on the Proposed Modifications:

	Object	Support	Total
FPMOD 3.1 (Policy NK3)	33	2	35
FPMOD 4.1 (Policy E8)	1	8	9
FPMOD 5.1 (Policy QL19)	0	7	7
FPMOD 6.1 (Policy FP10)	0	3	3
FPMOD 6.2 (Policy FP11)	0	2	2
FPMOD 6.3 (Policy FP14)	5	1	6
FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1) MA	6	1	7
FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1) ME	2	2	4
FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1) SW	39	0	39
FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1) Other	5	1	6
FPMOD 7.2 (Policy HP2a)	4	5	9
FPMOD 8.1 (Policy TP3 & Table TP3)	0	3	3
FPMOD 8.2 (Policy TP4)	0	2	2
FPMOD 8.3 (Policy TP5 & Table TP5)	0	3	3
FPMOD 8.4 (Policy TP7 & Table TP7)	2	6	8
Total	**97**	**46**	**143**

It should be noted that some of the comments received did not relate to a specific Proposed Modification and were therefore classified as "Not Valid". There were 37 such additional comments. These are set out at the end of Section 1 of the report for information.

There were also a small number of consultees who replied to the consultation but had no comments to make and these, therefore, have not been recorded.

Format of Report

This report is structured as follows:

- 1. COMMENTS ON THE FURTHER PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS
  Objections are listed first, followed by supporting comments.

- 2. LIST OF RESPONDENTS

1. COMMENTS ON THE FURTHER PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

FPMOD 3.1
Policy NK3 (Swale)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2481	F064	Mr	Abbott	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0639	Object	Objects to removal of the word "science". Removal of the word "science" is not justified on the grounds provided by the KSP. This means downgrading aspirations for a true "science park" and instead turning it into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3687	F045	Mr	Allen	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0601	Object	Objects to omission of the word "science". By omitting the word "science" means downgrading the aspirations of a true science park and is not acceptable.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3693	F068	Mrs	Ayres	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0645	Object	Cannot see why the Plan has been changed regarding the Science Park. It would be better to site any commercial venture nearer to public	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								transport.	knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. It is acknowledged that the location of KSP is not the optimum if development were being planned 'from scratch'. However it is the kernel of established activity that provides the rationale and potential of the cluster at KSP. Significant development will be subject to the development of a Travel Plan in line with Policy TP2 of the Deposit Plan. No further change proposed.
2446	F039	Mrs	Bispham	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0591	Object	Objects to omission of the word "science" as this would lower the desire for a science park and allow it to develop into a business park for technology.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3700	F087	Ms	Bonney	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0683	Object	Objects to the watering down of the wording from "science" to "technology and knowledge". The Kent Science Park operates under the label of a science park that specialises in life sciences and is a fully paid up member of the UK Science	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								Park Association. To downgrade it from "science" to "technology and knowledge based cluster" would reduce the status of the KSP to a business park, to the detriment of the area, including a negative impact on the surrounding countryside as a result. This is an attempt via the back door to convert KSP into a business park and it would be pointless to even consider any further development of the site, when business park development is clearly more suitable in other parts of Swale, namely to the north west of Sittingbourne where there is suitable road access to service such a site. Questions the KSP's eligibility as a member of the UK Science Park Association should the wording be downgraded from "science" to "technology and knowledge based cluster".	reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3692	F065	Mr	Chivers	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0640	Object	Objects to omission of the word "science". Believes this will result in the site becoming just another business park. Of course, this is what many believe is behind this expansion. Will then see the site filled with any company requiring space/buildings to conduct any business it desires.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2572	F060	Ms	Chivers	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0632	Object	Omitting the word "science" will result in this site becoming just another business park. Of course, this is what many believe is behind this expansion. Will then see the site filled with any company requiring space/buildings to conduct any business it desires.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2516	F058	Dr	Das	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0628	Object	The Kent Science Park seeks to remove the word "science". This is not justified on the grounds provided by KSP and is simply a means to downgrade plans for a true "science park" and develop it instead into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2517	F059	Mrs	Das	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0630	Object	The Kent Science Park is seeking to omit the word "science". Removal of the word "science" is not justified on the grounds provided by Kent Science Park. It is simply a means to downgrade plans for a true "science park" and develop it instead into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3690	F061	Ms	Doorey	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0634	Object	Massive effort being made to get the large scale development of the Kent Science Park into the Structure Plan. Following strong objections, understand that the planners have now decided to make last minute changes to the proposals in an effort to drive them through. Objections still	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								stand. By removing the words "life sciences", this downgrades the KSP's aspirations for a 'flagship' science park to a technology business park or 'light industrial unit'. Also appears that developers see this site as an opportunity to bolt on plans to build further new homes on surrounding greenfield sites. It is concerning that Swale proposes to accept another 800 dwellings in the Structure Plan. This piece of countryside faces pressure from developers who believe proposals to build will ensure prosperity comes; a bypass that would simply open more land to development; and a motorway junction that falls short of the extra traffic generated. Swale already has insufficient GPs to serve the area, there is a struggle to get children into education, utilities are at breaking point, and plans to redevelop the High Street are on the drawing board. How would adding more traffic and homes improve the situation? The original proposal in the Structure Plan for considered small scale expansion of the site within the site's boundaries is the correct way forward. This would create a 'village development' that would not overpower the surrounding area. Natural evolution of the site will be self-generating and will give the local area and infrastructure a chance of keeping pace.	this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. The EIP Panel Report confirmed the inclusion of KSP as a technology and knowledge cluster in the Plan. The additional housing provision proposed for Swale responds to the EIP Panel's recommendation that provision should take greater account of the housing capacity within Swale that the local plan review has already identified. There was no endorsement through the EIP for major housing development to the south of Sittingbourne in association with expansion of the Kent Science Park itself. No further change proposed.
2527	F053	Mrs	Isaac	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0620	Object	By omitting the word "science" this is not justified on the grounds provided by the KSP. It is simply a means to downgrade aspirations for a true "science park" and instead turn it into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2526	F052	Mr	Isaac	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0618	Object	By omitting the word "science" this is not justified on the grounds provided by the KSP. It is simply a means to downgrade aspirations for a true "science park" and instead turn it into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report).The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan No further change proposed.
3684	F035	A	Jensen	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0582	Object	Objects to omission of the word "science". This will result in this site becoming just another business park. Of course, this is what many believe is behind this expansion. We will then see the site filled with any company requiring space/buildings to conduct any business it desires.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3691	F063	Mr	Jones	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0637	Object	Objects to Kent Science Park removing "science" as this simply implies that their proposal for a true science park is unviable. This would downgrade their original proposals to expand simply to become instead a business park. Having worked at the Shell site for 38 years, knows the history and geography of the site, and also that only 60% of the buildings are being used - the remainder are unoccupied and falling into disrepair. There is absolutely no justification for further expansion.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. Provision for expansion at the KSP encompasses intensification of use within the existing developed footprint. This would be consistent with the emphasis of the Plan on efficient use of land and prioritisation of the re-use of previously developed land and previously used buildings. No further change proposed.
3685	F042	Mr	Marchant	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0596	Object	Removal of the word "science" is not justified on the grounds provided by Kent Science Park. It is simply a means to downgrade aspirations for a true 'science' park and instead turn it into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3695	F077	Mrs	Monday	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0667	Object	Objects to the Kent Science Park's plans to omit the word "science" from their title. This means that it will be turned into a technology business park instead of a true 'science park'.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									No further change proposed.
2438	F069	Mrs	Murphy	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0647	Object	Objects to the provision of improved access arrangements and the change to a technology and knowledge based cluster. This site is near an important nature reserve and located in the countryside. There are few public transport opportunities there. Any business development should be located in town with access to railway and bus services. As there will no longer be a science park there is no need to develop the improved access arrangements as the site's importance will be downgraded.	Policy does not endorse the downgrading of activity at KSP – indeed the essence of policy towards technology and knowledge clusters (FP4) is to build on and reinforce their distinctive and high grade character. It is acknowledged that the location of KSP is not the optimum if development were being planned 'from scratch'. However it is the kernel of established activity that provides the rationale and potential of the cluster at KSP. Significant development will be subject to the development of a Travel Plan in line with Policy TP2 of the Deposit Plan. No further change proposed.
2439	F070	Mr	Murphy	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0651	Object	Objects to the proposed modification. It is totally unsuited for any form of business venture as: 1. Access, facilities and services are almost non-existent. 2. If the 'science' aspect has been dropped then what is the need for this facility - why can't any such 'downgraded' development be accommodated within one of the many existing business/retail parks. 3. The site is immediately adjacent to an important wildlife sanctuary. 4. Seems to contradict FPMOD 5.1 (Policy QL19).	Policy does not endorse the downgrading of activity at KSP – indeed the essence of policy towards technology and knowledge clusters (FP4) is to build on and reinforce their distinctive and high grade character. It is acknowledged that the location of KSP is not the optimum if development were being planned 'from scratch'. However it is the kernel of established activity that provides the rationale and potential of the cluster at KSP. Significant development will be subject to the development of a Travel Plan in line with Policy TP2 of the Deposit Plan. No further change proposed.
3698	F080	Dr	Panton	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0671	Object	Does not believe omission of the word "science" is justified on the grounds given. KSP is simply seeking a means to achieve its proposed expansion by businesses of a more generic nature. They should not be allowed to change their stance so radically at this stage unless they also change their name back to "business park".	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2566	F072	Mr & Mrs	Radcliffe	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0658	Object	Strongly objects to this change in tactics by the Kent Science Park, thus fundamentally altering their original intention of expanding the site as a true 'science park'. Now that this proposal has obviously floundered, any proposed new expansion will become downgraded into yet another business park/distribution centre. Of the 56 firms listed on site (www.ksp-uk.com/tenants/alphabeticallist.asp?.nav1.21=11 , accessed 25.1.06), at least 36 are not 'scientific' are office based call centres (e.g. Amicus Response Ltd), financial firms (e.g. Sittingbourne Accountancy Services Ltd), or distributors (e.g. Galleon Ltd) – all of which belong on existing brownfield sites to the north of Sittingbourne where facilities and road networks are already in place. Now that Pfizers are leaving the site there is no justification whatsoever for further expansion, whether scientific or not.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3694	F071	Mrs	Reynolds	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0656	Object	The removal of the word 'science' is simply not justified on the grounds provided by the KSP. It is simply a means to downgrade aspirations for a true 'science park' and instead turn it into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3683	F033	Drs	Richards	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0578	Object	Omitting the word "science" is not justified on the grounds provided by the Kent Structure Plan. This would mean a downgrade in	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								aspiration for a true science park and instead turn it into a technology business park.	knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3688	F049	Mr	Sills	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0614	Object	Objects to omitting the word "science" as this means downgrading the aspirations from a true "science park" to merely a technology business park. This would lead to expansion on a non-scientific business retailed basis, which is not part of the original plan and unacceptable for a countryside location such as Broadoak.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2597	F048	Mrs	Sills	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0612	Object	In seeking to omit the word "science" from the document, the Kent Science Park site will be devalued and it may start to admit general business retailers to the park which could then be the birth of expansion on the site which will then be seeking to increase its boundary. The present boundary of the park must remain where it is.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2598	F096	Mrs	Smith	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0702	Object	Objects to the omission of the word 'science'. This will almost certainly enable the creation of a general business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2461	F034	B D	Steer	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0580	Object	Objects to omission of the word "science". This will result in this site becoming just another business park. Of course, this is what many believe is behind this expansion. We will then see the site filled with any company requiring space/buildings to conduct any business it desires.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3697	F079	Mrs	Trott	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0670	Object	Understands that the word "science" will be omitted from this policy. Objects to the change of wording as this downgrades the aspirations of the Kent Science Park to provide highly skilled employment in science related businesses. There would also not be the incentive or necessity for an affiliation with a university or other academic body. Concerned that the Kent Science Park could end up as a general business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3696	F078	Mr	Trott	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0669	Object	Objects to the removal of the word "science" as this now enables the Kent Science park to encourage other businesses apart from science based companies. Surely this is detrimental to the original plan of being a science park and could allow almost any type of company to trade there. Will the area be renamed "Kent Business Park".	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3682	F031	Mr	Vigeon	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0576	Object	[Respondent has marked FPMOD 6.1 but refers in objection to FPMOD 3.1]. The removal of the word "science" is simply not justified on the grounds provided by the Kent Structure Plan. It is simply a means to downgrade aspirations for a 'true science park'; and instead turn it into a 'technology business park' (i.e. trading estate).	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2492	F090	Mr	Wilks	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0691	Object	Objects to the change of words from "science based cluster" to "technology and knowledge based cluster". The complex was renamed Kent Science Park at the time of the KMSP EIP. Twenty objections were lodged without	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								proposing any consultation with residents on the expansion of the Park for a mixed use development. The changes proposed to the KMSP by Kent Science Park were not accepted by the EIP Panel. Similar objections and proposals were made to the 1st Deposit Draft Swale Local Plan. Following strong opposition by local residents Local Plan Policy B20 was re-drafted as Policy B26 to: "(c) schedule of uses that will be permitted on the site, comprising those compatible with the use of the site as a 'Science Park' as defined by the 'UKSPA'". Welcomes the expansion of the KSP within its present boundary fence, provided the expansion is restricted to the present terminology, namely ' an innovation hub and science based cluster', and B1 users. Any watering down of the wording in Policy NK3 will be a step towards the ultimate ambition of the KSP to establish, at a location just 500m from the Kent Downs AONB, a 76ha mixed use industrial estate.	reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3701	F089	Mr	Hudson	Bapchild Parish Council	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0689	Object	Strongly objects to the change of wording from "science" to "technology and knowledge" and does not understand why the wording is required to be adjusted to ensure compatible terminology. The Kent Science Park operates under the banner of a science park who specialise in life sciences and is a full member of the UK Science Park Association. To downgrade its label to a technology and knowledge based cluster would relinquish any responsibility that the current site owner has in terms of ensuring the quality and status of prospective tenants as well as the future of this site as a centre of science. If the owners of the site are to uphold their aspirations to become a leading light within the SE in terms of science then it can not be allowed to just become another technology and knowledge park, otherwise the entire reasoning behind its current location is lost and it would become pointless to even consider any further development of the site. One might question its eligibility as a member of the UK Science Park Association should this happen, which we are sure would not accept the dozens of existing technology parks as members.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2560	F086	Mrs	Bexon	Bredgar Parish Council	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0681	Object	Objects to alteration of description from "science" to "technology and knowledge", the suggested reasoning being to ensure compatible terminology. This is self contradictory if the description is intended to define the occupational uses on the site. The Kent Science Park currently advertises as a science park specialising in life sciences as a member of the UK Science Park Association. Redefining its scope of activity to a technology and knowledge cluster would cease to distinguish the site from any other business activity - all of which are driven by technology and knowledge. It would also diminish and remove any aspiration and responsibility that the current site owners claim to have in ensuring the future of this site as a centre of science. If it is the intention of the owners of the site and the planning authorities, to maintain the aspiration that this site should lead within the SE in terms of science, then reducing the site to another business park, albeit with a brand name of 'technology and knowledge cluster', is a huge contradiction and the aspiration is lost. The eligibility of the KSP as a member of the UK Science Park Association would be questioned.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
2471	F044	Mrs	Jordan	Rodmersham Parish Council	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0599	Object	The removal of the word "science" is not justified on the grounds given by Kent Science Park. It is simply a means to downgrade aspirations for a true science park and instead turn it into a technology business park.	Elsewhere in the Plan (Policy FP4 of the Deposit Plan) the Kent Science Park is described as a technology and knowledge cluster. The revised wording to Policy NK3 brings the reference to Kent Science Park within this policy in line with the description of activity envisaged for KSP in Policy FP4. The KMSP EIP Panel endorsed the role of KSP as technology and knowledge cluster (para 5.41 of their report). The role envisaged for the cluster is to build on its established strengths in the life sciences and reference to this will be included in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Plan. No further change proposed.
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 3.1 (NK3)	M-0544	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 3.1	M-0603	Support	Very anxious that any development does not	Support for the modification which

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
					(NK3)			harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	relates specifically to the description of the Kent Science Park noted.

FPMOD 4.1
Policy E8 (Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
3703	F092	Ms	Welch	.	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0693	Object	Both supports and objects. Wildlife habitats and species must be protected and enhanced as is stated, but the whole plan contradicts this effort if there is to be building on greenfield sites. Wildlife legislation often cannot be used to protect endangered species e.g. the trimming of a hedge planted 60 years ago which has become the roost of starlings, and endangered species. How many hedges, trees, etc will be destroyed with these new plans. What effort is to be made to stop these new settlements from being totally sterile. Trees are rarely planted along with housing. As well as wildlife areas we should have integrated habitats.	Policy E8 emphasises the role of habitat creation and management, and requires that site evaluation be undertaken to assess the nature conservation value of any potential development sites and that land for nature conservation be identified and safeguarded as part of development proposals. Policy E9 addresses the maintenance and enhancement of tree and woodland cover. More widely the intent of the Structure Plan is to minimise the requirement for the use of greenfield land especially where this has specific environmental value. No further change proposed.
1246	F025	Cllr Mrs	McCabe	.	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0566	Support	Strongly supports the change of wording regarding the protection of all wildlife habitats and species. Fully supports the strong policies in the Structure Plan to protect wildlife and biodiversity.	Support noted.
2438	F069	Mrs	Murphy	.	FPMOD 4.1	M-0648	Support	Supports importance being given to wildlife	Support noted.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
					(E8)			habitat.	
2439	F070	Mr	Murphy	.	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0652	Support	Supports the protection of wildlife and the environment as proposed.	Support noted
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0545	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0604	Support	Very anxious that any development does not harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	Support noted.
214	F047	Mr	Moyse	Kent Wildlife Trust	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0610	Support	The proposed modification brings the policy more closely in line with PPS9 which seeks overall conservation and enhancement of biodiversity rather than being limited only to habitats of recognised importance.	Support noted.
1120	F038	Miss	Mills	Kingsnorth Parish Council	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0587	Support	Supports the changes in FPMOD 4.1.	Support noted.
1008	F057	Mrs	Bosley	West Kingsdown Parish Council	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0627	Support	This policy is strengthened by the deletion of "important".	Support noted.

FPMOD 5.1
Policy QL19 (Strategic Green Space Initiatives)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2439	F070	Mr	Murphy	.	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0653	Support	It is essential that our environment is protected (that is one of the reasons why FPMOD 3.1 is so unacceptable!)	Support noted.
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0546	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0605	Support	Very anxious that any development does not harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra	Support noted.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	
2246	F040	Ms	Simpson	CPRE (Maidstone District)	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0592	Support	Strongly supports the modifications as they relate to the general principles embodied in the policy, namely the provision of green-space, heritage, wildlife and access initiatives associated not only with major schemes of building development, particularly for dwellings, but also for smaller schemes. Will help to encourage wildlife, contribute to air quality and areas of formal and informal leisure. The concept of enabling development, not only by converting the building to an alternative use, but also by seeking new build not directly associated with the heritage is often invoked as necessary to restore heritage buildings. Has some anxiety about extending the heritage aspect, but the strengthening of the other aspects is very positive and there is also Policy QL11. General principles of the policy also underpin areas outside Growth Areas, and may include the 'New Growth Points'. CPRE has learned that Maidstone might be so designated, hence interest in FPMOD 5.1. Deplores the idea that Maidstone would become one of these New Growth Points but now understands in light of FPMOD 7.1. Overall, supports FPMOD 5.1.	Support noted. QL19 specifically addresses large scale green space initiatives in North and East Kent. Other policies addressing green space, countryside access, habitat management also apply across the Structure Plan area e.g. E8, E11, E12 and QL18.
1892	F003	Mr	Bearn	Favoured Locations Ltd	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0527	Support	Now more comprehensive.	Support noted.
214	F047	Mr	Moyse	Kent Wildlife Trust	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0611	Support	The proposed modification reflects Kent Wildlife Trust's recommendations and brings a needed consistency of approach to green space issues in regeneration areas.	Support noted.
1120	F038	Miss	Mills	Kingsnorth Parish Council	FPMOD 5.1 (QL19)	M-0588	Support	Supports the changes in FPMOD 5.1.	Support noted.

FPMOD 6.1
Policy FP10 (Tourism, Development and Regeneration)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 6.1 (FP10)	M-0547	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 6.1 (FP10)	M-0606	Support	Very anxious that any development does not harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	Support noted.
2123	F094	Ms	Sanders	Blueco Ltd c/o Drivers Jonas	FPMOD 6.1 (FP10)	M-0699	Support	Supports the further modification and welcomes the additional clarification provided through cross reference to Table FP4, which sets out the strategic hierarchy of centres.	Support noted.

FPMOD 6.2
Policy FP11 (Tourist Accommodation)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 6.2 (FP11)	M-0548	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
2123	F094	Ms	Sanders	Blueco Ltd c/o Drivers Jonas	FPMOD 6.2 (FP11)	M-0700	Support	Supports the further modification and welcomes the additional clarification provided through cross reference to Table FP4, which sets out the strategic hierarchy of centres.	Support noted.

FPMOD 6.3
Policy FP14 (Sequential Consideration of Sites for Retail and Leisure)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
1110	F076	Mr	Baker	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0666	Object	Does not agree that the word "exceptionally" should be removed. The Panel could have recommended this but did not. There is a case in Kent for keeping the additional qualifications, including the word "exceptionally" as follows: 1. Evidence of the damage to town centre shopping caused by the growth of out of centre locations has continued to grow since the EIP and Panel Report. 2. In areas such as Kent, most towns are significantly congested around such out of centre locations as already exist, and this often affects neighbouring residents' quality of life. Further out of centre growth should therefore be more stringently controlled than by the mere application of national guidance. 3. Areas such as Kent also suffer from very significant pressure on town centre sites for housing under PPG3. Redundant employment sites are very quickly converted to residential use, whereas in many cases they could also be suitable for retail use as an extension to the existing centre, or for mixed retail-residential. Once those sites have gone to pure residential they are no longer available for sequential consideration for retail bulky goods/food, so there will be a greater tendency to seek out of centre sites. Need to give an incentive to retail developers/operators to secure an interest in town centre/edge of centre sites rather than letting them go for housing. A far more sustainable solution would be to maintain the "exceptionally" wording to send a message that genuine and timely attempts to find edge of centre sites are required and it should be indeed the exception that out of town sites are required in these circumstances.	A blanket ban on such development would be contrary to national policy (PPS6). However out of centre retail proposals must provide evidence of need and are subject to a sequential test of development locations that prioritises sites within or at the edge of centres (FP14). Access to a choice of transport modes has also to be demonstrated (FP14 and TP2). Application of the sequential approach through Policy FP14 should underline the prior consideration of town centre/edge of centre sites for retail use in the preparation of Local Development Documents. Policy FP13 requires the local authorities to include policies in LDDs to support the retail function of the key centres. Whilst the EIP Panel made no specific recommendation regarding the use of the term 'exceptionally' their report notes (at para 5.72) that Policy FP14 'inappropriately applies more stringent criteria' than national guidance. No further change proposed.
1246	F025	Cllr Mrs	McCabe	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0565	Object	Objects to the removal of the word "exceptional" regarding sites for out of town food or bulky goods stores. These large supermarkets use their considerable political power and we need	A blanket ban on such development would be contrary to national policy (PPS6). However out of centre retail proposals must provide evidence of

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								this restraint to protect the countryside.	need and are subject to a sequential test of development locations that prioritises sites within or at the edge of centres (FP14). Access to a choice of transport modes has also to be demonstrated (FP14 and TP2). Policy also emphasises that where retail developments in out of centre locations can be justified this should involve sites within the confines of the major/principal urban areas (FP14). In this regard the presumption against greenfield or countryside locations is very strong. No further change proposed.
2438	F069	Mrs	Murphy	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0649	Object	Objects to any further out of town large food or bulky goods stores as a matter of course. Should only be allowed as an exception. Town centres are dying and non-car owners are disadvantaged by out of town sites. Car use is also increased at out of town sites.	A blanket ban on such development would be contrary to national policy (PPS6). However out of centre retail proposals must provide evidence of need and are subject to a sequential test of development locations that prioritises sites within or at the edge of centres (FP14). Access to a choice of transport modes has also to be demonstrated (FP14 and TP2). No further change proposed.
2439	F070	Mr	Murphy	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0654	Object	There are too many out of town shopping sites at present. Local towns such as Sittingbourne and Sheerness are suffering directly because of this. Why is there a need for out of town sites in this area when emphasis should be on the new retail developments planned locally. New out of town sites will require transport links or are they only to be accessed by private transport. In this respect the proposal for large food or bulky goods stores should be allowed as an 'exception' and not as a matter of course.	A blanket ban on such development would be contrary to national policy (PPS6). However out of centre retail proposals must provide evidence of need and are subject to a sequential test of development locations that prioritises sites within or at the edge of centres (FP14). Access to a choice of transport modes has also to be demonstrated (FP14 and TP2). No further change proposed.
3703	F092	Ms	Welch	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0695	Object	Are conference hotels going to be built or are they refurbishment? If they are new buildings is there a need or is it a way of getting hold of EU money? Has need been demonstrated? These tourist sites amid the out of town sites of bulky stores make it sound like Disney; it seems the idea is to destroy what is natural then create a theme park. Out of town stores should be the rare exception. Urges listening to CPRE as they	FP14 is concerned with a sequential approach to the location of retail development. Hotel development is covered by other policies of the Plan, principally FP11. A blanket ban on out of centre retail development would be contrary to national policy (PPS6). However out of centre retail proposals must provide

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								at least make sense.	evidence of need and are subject to a sequential test of development locations that prioritises sites within or at the edge of centres (FP14). Access to a choice of transport modes has also to be demonstrated (FP14 and TP2). No further change proposed.
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0549	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.

FPMOD 7.1

Policy HP1 (Housing Provision and Distribution 2001-2016): Maidstone

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2288	F029	Mr & Mrs	Atkins	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0571	Object	The footnote attached to the 2001-2016 figure for Maidstone under FPMOD 7.1 is dangerously misleading and should be deleted. It appears to imply that Maidstone alone is singled out among all the districts for unlimited levels of housing growth, the only proviso being that sites should be on 'sustainably located sites' identified through the LDD process. The term 'sustainably located' is vague and often used to justify the development of a wide variety of sites e.g. it can be taken to mean sustainable purely in transport terms and could therefore include defined green wedge areas within the urban boundary and greenfield land subject to countryside constraints on the edges of the urban area – recognised by the EIP Panel as a key issue in the case of Maidstone town. The Panel's actual recommendation referred to a footnote 'subject to circumstances outlined in paragraph 9.184' of the Panel Report which read '. . . we consider that any increases in housing provision should be focussed in the town centre near the main public transport nodes and employment centres'. Strongly agree with the Councils' original response to the Panel's recommendation regarding this footnote i.e. that the requirement	The inclusion of a footnote to Policy HP1 for Maidstone stems directly from an EIP Panel recommendation to this effect (R9.15) and objections maintained by Government at the first round of Modifications to the omission by the Councils of such a reference. It is agreed that the expectation of the Plan is that the HP1 quantities for all districts are met (this is explicitly stated in Policy HP2a) and thus the Policy HP1 quantities are de facto minima in all instances. Meeting the HP1 quantity should be informed by assessment of urban capacity and the criteria for sustainably located development in the Structure Plan (Policy HP2a). The proposed footnote indicates that any increase in housing provision will be governed by the study of urban capacity and this takes forward the Panel's reference to increased provision being focussed in the town centre. Para 9.184 of the Panel Report also indicates that LDF preparation may identify 'more sustainable sites'

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								to meet the housing quantities in the Plan applies equally to all districts, and that additional sustainably located sites may emerge through any of their LDDs. To appear to single out Maidstone in this way runs completely contrary to the core strategic planning and economic strategies of the Structure Plan itself, the emerging SE Plan, and extant RPG, all of which identify Thames Gateway and Ashford/East Kent as areas where growth is to be directed. To single out a Borough outside these areas where the District Council is anxious to increase development levels will drive a coach and horses through these policies. It will also tend to prejudice the chances of success in other regions in greater need of economic regeneration. Through many statements in the local press it appears that the current leadership of the Borough Council seem to think it is necessary for Maidstone town to grow at any cost. A growth competition with Ashford and North Kent is not only completely unnecessary, but would be likely to be damaging, both to the growth areas' chances of successful regeneration, and to Maidstone's unique setting. If County and regional planning should do anything it should take a robust stance in sorting out this kind of harmful competition. Writing this as very long standing residents of the town whose children are making their lives here, so while not unconcerned about its future prosperity, are extremely worried that the intricate relationship between the town and its setting is threatened. It is important that the Structure Plan does not supply developers and the Borough Council with a useful vaguely-worded loophole through which they can realise their ambitions to promote unnecessary development on peripheral sites to the detriment of the special setting of the town. Therefore requests that this footnote is deleted. If it is to be retained, it should be made less ambiguous and reflect the Panel's qualification concerning the location of any increases in housing provision. A reference to that	with the potential to increase housing provision locally and that this should be encouraged. No further change proposed.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								qualification in the Explanatory Text (which is made clear as not being part of the statutory plan) would fail to recognise its crucial importance to the Panel's recommendation. It should be given the status of inclusion in the footnote to the Policy, if that is to be retained. If footnote is retained, requests the following amendment: Insert after 'Borough' the words 'as for all districts' and insert after 'sites', focussed in the town centre near the main public transport and employment centres' to clearly reflect the full import of the Panel's recommendation.	
2103	F015	Cllr	Harwood	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0553	Object	The proposed addition of the note to HP1 for Maidstone is not supported. Kent and Medway Councils reached the proposed housing figures using a rigorously researched methodology based upon an analysis of opportunities and constraints. To abdicate the Structure Plan's strategic responsibility in producing district housing numbers to the vagaries of a narrow Local Development Framework/Document is unfair in relation to other Districts and runs the risk of compounding current negative trends within a district already faced with major environmental and infrastructure constraints to unsustainable housing growth levels. The relative scarcity of previously developed sites within Maidstone Borough (when compared to adjacent local authority areas such as Medway, Swale and Tonbridge and Malling) means that green field sites will absorb the bulk of housing growth. The greater attractiveness of green field sites over previously developed sites in the eyes of developers teaches us that regeneration opportunities in surrounding areas could be hit by greater housing growth in Maidstone. It is clear that the proposed extra text relating to Maidstone Borough housing figures should be deleted.	The inclusion of a footnote to Policy HP1 for Maidstone stems directly from an EIP Panel recommendation to this effect (R9.15) and objections maintained by Government at the first round of Modifications to the omission by the Councils of such a reference. It is agreed that the expectation of the Plan is that the HP1 quantities for all districts are met (this is explicitly stated in Policy HP2a) and thus the Policy HP1 quantities are de facto minima in all instances. Meeting the HP1 quantity should be informed by assessment of urban capacity and the criteria for sustainably located development in the Structure Plan (Policy HP2a). The proposed footnote indicates that any increase in housing provision will be governed by the study of urban capacity and this takes forward the Panel's reference to increased provision being focussed in the town centre. A key consideration in the determination of the district housing distribution in the Structure Plan was the incidence and relative scale of opportunities based on the use of previously developed land. Policy CC2 maintains the position that no large scale release of greenfield land for housing will be provided

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									beyond an amount equivalent to that already allocated in the Maidstone Local Plan. No further change proposed.
920	F062	Mrs	Bowdery	Boxley Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0636	Object	Does not support the suggested modification regarding the addition of notes relating to Maidstone. The vagueness of this statement would potentially allow additional housing growth in an area that is already overcrowded and which has poor infrastructure that is unable to support any more demand.	The inclusion of a footnote to Policy HP1 for Maidstone stems directly from an EIP Panel recommendation to this effect (R9.15) and objections maintained by Government at the first round of Modifications to the omission by the Councils of such a reference. No further change proposed.
2246	F040	Ms	Simpson	CPRE (Maidstone District)	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0593	Object	Strongly objects to the figures for Maidstone Borough being given as a minimum. Even though "any increase in housing provision will be governed by study of urban capacity and identification of sustainably located sites through the preparation of LDFs", there could be in practice no limit to the housing numbers which could be provided within this Policy. Makes a nonsense of any of the other Borough/District allocations and Maidstone is not even a designated "Growth Area". If housing in Maidstone were allowed to grow exponentially, there would have to be new large scale housing development on greenfield sites. There is a danger that development of readily available greenfield sites will lead to the regeneration of central Maidstone being ignored. There is a great risk of this happening under the Governments proposals advanced in "Planning for Housing Provision" (July 2005) and the draft PPG3 consultation. The KMSP, which underwent a very thorough EIP, at which representatives from a large number of organisations had the opportunity to put forward views on the future development of the county as a whole, and by District/Unitary authority, should produce a strategic policy that consistently deals with the whole area. That may mean resisting Government pressure to dictate elements of the Structure Plan, and any attempts from local councils to overturn the carefully explored situation at the EIP. The average dwellings for a 15 year period for Maidstone is 433, which is still quite high, given	The inclusion of a footnote to Policy HP1 for Maidstone stems directly from an EIP Panel recommendation to this effect (R9.15) and objections maintained by Government at the first round of Modifications to the omission by the Councils of such a reference. It is agreed that the expectation of the Plan is that the HP1 quantities for all districts are met (this is explicitly stated in Policy HP2a) and thus the Policy HP1 quantities are de facto minima in all instances. Meeting the HP1 quantity should be informed by assessment of urban capacity and the criteria for sustainably located development in the Structure Plan (Policy HP2a). The proposed footnote indicates that any increase in housing provision will be governed by the study of urban capacity and this takes forward the Panel's reference to increased provision being focussed in the town centre. Para 9.184 of the Panel Report also indicates that LDF preparation may identify 'more sustainable sites' with the potential to increase housing provision locally and that this should be encouraged. Policy CC2 maintains the position that no large scale release of greenfield land for housing will be provided beyond an amount equivalent to that

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								the environmental constraints that make the surrounding rural countryside so attractive, but does provide opportunities for regeneration of the urban area. The proposed extra qualification attached to the housing figures for Maidstone in Policy HP1 should be deleted.	already allocated in the Maidstone Local Plan. No further change proposed.
212	F082	Dr	Newport	CPRE Kent	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0675	Object	The modification relating to Maidstone is a cause for concern. Can see no need for Maidstone Borough to be singled out as having a housing allocation target specified as a minimum. This holds the prospect of greenfield sprawl at the expense of urban regeneration, allowing market demand to take precedence over a more measured assessment of real need in the Borough. The implications for the loss of greenfield space, and for the transport planning of the town and its rural surroundings, are potentially disastrous. Development must under no circumstances be allowed to proceed ahead of the provision of infrastructure to support that growth. The current drought facing Kent and Medway now makes it more important that the seemingly ever-increasing pressure to increase the supply of new homes is not allowed to continue unchecked. Assurances given by the water companies that water resources will be in balance or possibly surplus (subject to certain conditions being met) seem increasingly hollow in the face of their current inability to supply existing demand without placing significant demands on the aquatic environment. Some of these conditions are no closer to being achieved than they were at the start of the process of producing the KMSP. Future weather predictions indicate that an increase in the frequency of dry winters may well prevent a strategic supply source such as Broadoak from ever achieving its potential. Heavy reliance on such an uncertain future strategic source, and on efficiency measures which have yet to materialise, must not be allowed to underpin a level of development which can not be supported. Requests that modifications to Policy HP1 are	The inclusion of a footnote to Policy HP1 for Maidstone stems directly from an EIP Panel recommendation to this effect (R9.15) and objections maintained by Government at the first round of Modifications to the omission by the Councils of such a reference. It is agreed that the expectation of the Plan is that the HP1 quantities for all districts are met (this is explicitly stated in Policy HP2a) and thus the Policy HP1 quantities are de facto minima in all instances. Meeting the HP1 quantity should be informed by assessment of urban capacity and the criteria for sustainably located development in the Structure Plan (Policy HP2a). The proposed footnote indicates that any increase in housing provision will be governed by the study of urban capacity and this takes forward the Panel's reference to increased provision being focussed in the town centre. Para 9.184 of the Panel Report also indicates that LDF preparation may identify 'more sustainable sites' with the potential to increase housing provision locally and that this should be 'encouraged'. No further change proposed.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								deleted.	
1093	F001	Mr	Watkins	Kitewood Estates	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0688	Object	Notes to Policy HP1 - All the housing provision requirements for each district should be stated as minimum, not just Maidstone. There is no reason just to specify Maidstone as this implies that the other districts do not have to reach these housing requirements. The surplus or deficit of housing land as of 2001 from the adopted Structure Plan should be rolled forward as the starting position of the KMSP as of April 2001.	It is correct to say that the expectation of the Plan is that the HP1 quantities for all districts are met (and this is explicitly stated in Policy HP2a) and thus the Policy HP1 quantities are de facto minima in all instances. The inclusion of a footnote to Policy HP1 for Maidstone stems directly from an EIP Panel recommendation to this effect (R9.15) and objections maintained by Government at the first round of Modifications to the omission by the Councils of such a reference. The treatment of housing surpluses or deficits arising from the adopted Structure Plan does not directly relate to the modification proposed. This matter was in any event considered by the EIP Panel and taken into account in their findings on the overall level of housing provision for Kent and individual areas (Panel Report paras 4.53- 4.58 refer). No further change proposed.
3699	F084	Mr	Lander	Redrow Homes/Taylor Woodrow/David Wilson Homes c/o Boyer Planning Ltd	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) MA	M-0678	Support	Maidstone is capable of further sustainable growth within this Plan period, particularly in areas on the edge of the settlement, and existing allocated sites. The inclusion of 'minimum' housing figures will enable suitable levels of growth to meet requirements over the period of the Plan through the 'Plan, Monitor, Manage' approach.	Support noted.

FPMOD 7.1
Policy HP1 (Housing Provision and Distribution 2001-2016): Medway

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2644	F067	Mr	Warren	Medway Magna c/o Graham Warren Partnership	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) ME	M-0644	Object	As far as Chattenden is concerned, the Panel recognised that not all the land can be categorised as previously developed (Para 9.78 of report) and that the level of development proposed should be qualified to ensure that the appropriate sequential test is applied to any of the land that is not PDL. The appropriate test is in PPG3. The notes to HP1 should reflect the Panel's concern that in the event that Chattenden does not come forward when necessary then it should be made clear that alternative land may be identified. The note concerning HP1 as it relates to Medway should say as much. At present it refers to only the opposite scenario where development might come forward at a faster rate than expected from Chattenden. The obvious doubts that led the Panel to make the recommendation they did make it all the more unreasonable that the KMSP proposes a test that would put Chattenden on an equal footing with an urban extension. In failing to have proper regard to higher authority guidance the Plan leaves itself open to legal challenge.	This representation does not take account of the modification made to Policy NK2 (Medway) in response to the recommendations of the EIP Panel for the wording of that Policy. NK2 as modified refers to the consideration of alternative land in the event that the former defence land at Chattenden) fails to come forward when necessary to provide for the planned housing (and employment) provision for Medway. No further change proposed.
692	F075	Mr	Copsey	Ward Homes Ltd c/o David Lock Associates	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) ME	M-0665	Object	Objects to the proposed modifications in terms of the footnote relating to Medway. Agree with GOSE that securing the early delivery of strategic sites and the step change in housing sought in the Thames Gateway would be to increase housing figures for Medway. The current approach proposed will only serve to perpetuate the under-delivery of housing within the District, and will fail to establish a direction of travel for the higher rates of housing envisaged beyond the plan horizon of 2016. The housing figure for Medway should be increased to 15,000 to reflect the level of potential identified for the period to 2016 within the inter-regional statement.	The EIP Panel took full account of the Inter Regional Planning Statement on Thames Gateway and evidence on the deliverability of all the major regeneration sites in Medway. It was in the light of this evidence that the Panel concluded that no change was required to the Policy HP1 housing figures for Medway. No further change proposed.
1205	F093	Ms	Grant	Church	FPMOD 7.1	M-0697	Support	Supports the identification of Chattenden/Lodge	Support noted.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
				Commissioners for England c/o DTZ Debenham Tie Leung	(HP1) ME			Hill as a major area of previously developed land outside the urban area with the potential for a new settlement. Supports the increase in net dwelling numbers in this area for the period 2001-2016. In particular, supports the increase in housing numbers, as this reflects the scale of development that is expected to occur by 2016 on the key urban regeneration sites and the proposed new settlement at Chattenden/Lodge Hill. Supports the recognition in the Further Proposed Modifications that should a higher rate of development prove feasible on these sites this will be considered, subject to the provision of necessary infrastructure and services in accordance with an agreed development strategy for each site. However, believes that the military training area and barracks at Chattenden will not be able to deliver a truly sustainable mixed use community within [sp. without?] the inclusion of additional greenfield land surrounding the site. This is essential to provide the sufficient critical mass necessary to deliver a new settlement large enough to fund the provision of new and improved road and rail infrastructure necessary to deliver a new sustainable community. As part of the LDF for Medway, will seek a larger allocation to include greenfield land around Chattenden to create a new settlement that is truly sustainable. The former MOD land at Chattenden will undoubtedly have a role to play in the provision of housing during the plan period. However, concerned that without the inclusion of additional undeveloped land adjacent to Chattenden, the site will not be able to deliver a mixed-use sustainable community as required by the ODPM.	Endorsement of the principle of a new mixed use community at Chattenden/ Lodge Hill takes account of the opportunity provided by the scale of previously developed land in the area. The detailed configuration and form of development at Chattenden will be a matter for determination through the LDF process.
1293	F074	Mr	Parkes	Holdfast Consortium c/o Michael Parkes	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) ME	M-0662	Support	Welcomes the clarification that, if the allocated sites can produce more development in the plan period, then consideration will be given to allowing them to do so. However, would caution that there is a physical limit to the amount of housing production that can be achieved on any one site whilst maintaining an acceptable living environment for the new residents. Made the	Support noted. The Councils have agreed that the revised Explanatory Memorandum to the Structure Plan will be explicit in stating that the development at Chattenden/Lodge Hill can take place alongside the major urban regeneration sites pursuant to the delivery of the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								point at the EIP that the new settlement at Chattenden should be allowed to start in parallel with, and not behind, the regeneration sites in the main urban area, because they would (a) provide complementary products for the housing market and (b) the urban regeneration sites would not produce the amount of development originally anticipated in the draft plan in the early years of those developments. The Structure Plan authorities, in accepting the change that allows Chattenden to develop in parallel, tacitly acknowledge the reality that the regeneration sites and Chattenden have a relatively long lead in time to dwelling production and a finite capacity of production within the plan period. Without reliance on over-optimism, believes that the proposed modified wording allows for improvements on expected output without losing the essential focus on PDL.	Policy HP1 housing quantity.

FPMOD 7.1
Policy HP1 (Housing Provision and Distribution 2001-2016): Swale

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2481	F064	Mr	Abbott	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0638	Object	Opposes the addition of 800 more dwellings in Swale, bringing the total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale BC, the additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3687	F045	Mr	Allen	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0602	Object	Opposes the addition of 800 dwellings as this will bring an additional 1,600 dwellings to Swale since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council these additional homes cannot be built without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3693	F068	Mrs	Ayres	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0646	Object	Objects to FPMOD 7.1. The plan for 800 extra dwellings planned for Swale will take far too much farm land, or more houses will have to be fitted into the same space. It just doesn't seem to make sense.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
2446	F039	Mrs	Bispham	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0590	Object	Objects to the addition of 800 dwellings, making 1,600 and utilising more greenfield sites.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3700	F087	Ms	Bonney	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0684	Object	Swale has been swamped by new build homes, adding more to the existing allocation is simply lunacy. Houses have been built with little or no additional infrastructure. It is unsustainable for existing communities to be further burdened by adding more to housing numbers. In addition to the 800 dwellings added only recently, that are still out for consultation in the Swale Local Plan, understand that Swale are to increase densities on existing sites to accommodate the previous increase of 800 dwellings if indeed these are accepted. This will lead to the kind of housing densities not seen outside of inner city developments. While this might fall within Government targets its entirely inappropriate for the semi-rural location of Swale. It is absurd to consider high density housing in rural and semi	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								rural locations on the fringe of towns like Sittingbourne when town centre density should be increased and developed first. Any further allocation would, according to Swale's planning department, require a completely new site and one that would have to be located on green field sites. Swale is already one of the most affordable boroughs in Kent. Construction on this scale actually creates a demand and increases prices making housing even less affordable. The housing boom in Ashford has seen house price inflation dramatically increased since the building boom. Swale has a poor record in generating employment prospects with only one job being created for every two dwellings constructed. This is unsustainable and is forcing residents to commute out of Swale and in turn putting insurmountable pressure on our transport infrastructure. Where are the additional trains and car parks - the answer is there haven't been any. Have seen no further investment in terms of infrastructure to support the previous 800 dwellings and no consideration appears to have been given to this matter for allocation either.	the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. Other policies of the Plan address the relationship between density, the quality of development and the accessibility of development locations (see Policy HP3a). The relationship between development, provision of necessary infrastructure and employment is also addressed by the Plan (Polices SS1 and QL13). Whilst housing provision in Swale undoubtedly provides for population growth and in movement of people there is also substantial locally based housing need arising from local population growth and change and wider social trends. No further change proposed.
2572	F060	Ms	Chivers	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0633	Object	Objects to the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring the total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying even more precious green field sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3692	F065	Mr	Chivers	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0641	Object	Objects to the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring the total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Council these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying even more precious green field sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
2517	F059	Mrs	Das	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0631	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more green field sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
2516	F058	Dr	Das	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0629	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale. This would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more green field sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3690	F061	Ms	Doorey	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0635	Object	Massive effort being made to get the large scale development of the Kent Science Park into the Structure Plan. Following strong objections, understand that the planners have now decided to make last minute changes to the proposals in an effort to drive them through. Objections still stand. By removing the words "life sciences", this downgrades the KSP's aspirations for a 'flagship' science park to a technology business park or 'light industrial unit'. Also appears that developers see this site as an opportunity to bolt on plans to build further new homes on surrounding greenfield sites. It is concerning that Swale proposes to accept another 800 dwellings in the Structure Plan. This piece of countryside faces pressure from developers who believe proposals to build will ensure prosperity comes; a bypass that would simply open more land to development; and a motorway junction that falls short of the extra	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								traffic generated. Swale already has insufficient GPs to serve the area, there is a struggle to get children into education, utilities are at breaking point, and plans to redevelop the High Street are on the drawing board. How would adding more traffic and homes improve the situation? The original proposal in the Structure Plan for considered small scale expansion of the site within the site's boundaries is the correct way forward. This would create a 'village development' that would not overpower the surrounding area. Natural evolution of the site will be self-generating and will give the local area and infrastructure a chance of keeping pace.	addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. However neither the Structure Plan EIP Panel nor the modifications propose the identification of further strategic greenfield sites to support increased housing supply and there was no endorsement of the large scale mixed use development proposals incorporating major housing provision that were presented to the EIP on behalf of KSP. No further change proposed.
2526	F052	Mr	Isaac	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0619	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale BC these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
2527	F053	Mrs	Isaac	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0621	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale BC these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3684	F035	A	Jensen	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0583	Object	Objects to the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring the total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying even more precious greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3685	F042	Mr	Marchant	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0597	Object	Objects to the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3695	F077	Mrs	Monday	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0668	Object	Objects to an extra 800 dwellings in Swale which will entail more development on greenfield sites meaning a loss of yet more amenities with consequential stress on limited water supplies.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. There has been no objection from the Environment Agency to the proposed level of increased housing provision. No further change proposed.
2439	F070	Mr	Murphy	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0655	Object	Objects to this dramatic increase in housing. Our schools, medical, roads and transport facilities, etc cannot cope. Any future development will mean the loss of agricultural land and our local heritage.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
2438	F069	Mrs	Murphy	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0650	Object	Objects to the increase of 800 dwellings shown for Swale 2000-2016. This would mean either an increased density of housing or loss of farming land.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3698	F080	Dr	Panton	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0672	Object	Opposes the further 800 dwellings in Swale. This would bring the additional total to 1,600 since September 2005. The extra 800 cannot be accommodated without identifying more green field sites.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3694	F071	Mrs	Reynolds	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0657	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3683	F033	Drs	Richards	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0579	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring the total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								the Local Plan without identifying more greenfield sites for development.	given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
1103	F016	Mr & Mrs	Shaw	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0554	Object	Objects to the proposed extra, or any more housing for Sheppey. It is not needed or wanted. There is no provision for jobs, facilities, decent shops, entertainment, not even a cinema. To find decent jobs and shops, need to go off the Island. No wonder the roads are clogged up. The new bridge will not solve the problem of existing roads on the Island. The idea was to provide jobs then housing. The Island is subject to flooding, a constant occurrence in the Island, disregarding the risk for the area. This 'low cost housing' that we hear about will just be future slums in a few years time. Sheppey should never have been included in the Thames Gateway Scheme. Why turn Kent - the Garden of England into the Concrete Corner of England. 9,100 houses by 2016 is ludicrous and scandalous. Our schools are full, more and more children now go to schools off the Island. Where do we put all these children from all these extra houses, where are the Doctors, Dentists, and our hospital is a glorified clinic, and they are even threatening to take some of the beds away. What a way to prepare for more people to live here.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									No further change proposed.
3688	F049	Mr	Sills	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0615	Object	Objects to the proposal for 800 additional dwellings as, according to SBC, these additional houses cannot be accommodated without the use of greenfield sites for development. It is totally unacceptable to use more greenfield sites for development but, notwithstanding this, the local area cannot accommodate a development on this scale. The infrastructure is not in place, the congestion would be appalling and we do not have sufficient water supplies for the existing population, let alone an increase of 800 houses.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships. No further change proposed.
2597	F048	Mrs	Sills	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0613	Object	Further increase of 800 additional dwellings to be accepted by SBC will overload the already groaning infrastructure we have. To open up and use more greenfield sites to accommodate more new homes will have a devastating and negative effect on our surroundings. Half of Sittingbourne High Street is now misused and abused and that is on the Council's own doorstep. If that cannot be maintained however will extra housing maintenance be accommodated?	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships. No further change proposed.
2598	F096	Mrs	Smith	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0703	Object	Objects to the further addition of 800 houses because further green field land will have to be found which has not been identified for development. Thus even more countryside will be lost.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
2461	F034	B D	Steer	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0581	Object	Objects to the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale which would bring the total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Council, these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without identifying even more precious greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3682	F031	Mr	Vigeon	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0575	Object	Objects to the addition of a further 800 houses in Swale which would bring the total additional houses to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council, these additional houses cannot be accommodated in the Local Plan without using more greenfield sites for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3703	F092	Ms	Welch	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0696	Object	The numbers have been increased for Swale and Kent in general. Apart from all this being madness, would like to know where the water will come from. Are there regulations in place to ensure that all new buildings have solar heating and other conservation requirements. If not, why not? All these numbers are far too high.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									Panel. The Environment Agency as the statutory adviser on water supply matters has been consulted on the Structure Plan throughout and has not raised objection to the overall housing provision and its distribution now proposed. The Plan recognises the importance of 'sustainable construction' to further the efficient use of water and energy. Policies QL1 and NR0 address these considerations. No further change proposed.
2643	F066	Mr	Warren	Attwood Trust c/o Graham Warren Partnership	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0642	Object	The Plan originally made provision for 7,500 dwellings to 2016. The Proposed Modifications increased this by 800 to 8,300 dwellings. The increase now proposed in Further Modifications is 1,600 dwellings making a total of 9,100. Objections made in letter dated 9 October 2005 (copy with original representation) still apply in that the Panel's recommendation was that the Swale figure should be increased to 2,200. The figure of 1,600 still fails to reflect the likely rate of dwelling provision for Swale during the Plan period as well as address housing need identified by the demographic projections put forward by GOSE at the EIP. Policy HP1 should fully reflect the Panel's recommendation in respect of HP1 as it affects Swale.	The EIP Panel recommendation for Swale was that Policy HP1 be increased by 2,200 dwellings. In this the Panel relied on evidence to the EIP that the emerging Swale Local Plan allocated some 2,200 dwellings more than the Deposit KMSP Policy HP1 quantity. This evidence, and the draft local plan itself also indicate that this apparent extra capacity does not take account of issues of timing and delivery, particularly with regard to the large scale urban regeneration sites at Sittingbourne and Queenborough/ Rushenden that the Structure Plan itself proposes (in Policy NK3). This consideration is of added significance given the Panel's view (which has been accepted by the Councils) that the housing provision policy should extend only to 2016 and not 2021 as originally proposed. The Panel did not propose the identification within the Structure Plan of further strategic sites to augment housing supply – their view would appear to have been that policy provision should relate to the supply identified. Achievement of a policy figure based on the total housing land supply capacity would require full completion by 2016 of all the sites

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									concerned and particularly the major strategic sites. Assessment of housing capacity, reflected in the Swale Local Plan, indicates that three of these sites – Milton Creek Sittingbourne, Queenborough Creek/ Rushenden Road and East Hall Farm Sittingbourne have a collective capacity of some 2400 dwellings respectively but that delivery of almost 1000 dwellings of this capacity is anticipated beyond the period addressed by the Structure Plan i.e. to 2016. On this basis alone the increase of 2,200 dwellings referred to by the Panel would be reduced to c. 1200 dwellings. There is significant headroom between the housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan 2003 and current understanding of capacity even allowing for longer term delivery (post 2016) of a significant element of this. Taking account of deliverability considerations and the focus of Policy HP1 on the pre 2016 period an addition of 1600 dwellings to the provision for Swale 2001-2016 would respond to the level and sources of potential land supply, the likely delivery of the strategic development opportunities identified (in Policy NK3) and the scope to make efficient use of land identified for development. It would provide a realistic response to the concerns of Government and others in the context of the housing capacity considerations discussed above. At this level some further addition to land supply for the short term is nonetheless implied. No further change proposed
3701	F089	Mr	Hudson	Bapchild Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0690	Object	Swale cannot sustain a further increase in housing numbers in addition to the 800 dwellings added only recently, which are still out for consultation in the Swale Local Plan. Understand that Swale are to increase densities on existing sites to accommodate the previous	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								increase of 800 dwellings, if indeed these figures are accepted. While this might fall within Government targets it is entirely inappropriate for the semi-rural location of Swale. The growth of Swale is not happening from the centre outwards but the other way round, creating high storey, high density housing on the fringes of suburban edges of the towns and leaving low density development in the centre. The model is unworkable in planning terms, where services and infrastructure are designed to operate from the centre of towns outwards. Any further allocation would, according to Swale's planning department, require a completely new site and one that would have to be located on a greenfield site. This makes absolutely no sense whatsoever when you consider that Swale is already one of the most affordable boroughs in Kent. Construction on this scale actually creates a demand and increases prices making housing even less affordable. This is even further compounded by inward growth from people moving away from the inner city developments taking place in Dartford who currently have the very high housing densities being proposed here. Swale also has a poor record in generating employment prospects with only one job being created for every two dwellings constructed. This is unsustainable and is forcing residents to commute out of Swale and in turn putting insurmountable pressure on transport infrastructure. This will only get worse as the average yearly construction figures are set to increase by approximately 140% over the next ten years. Have seen no further investment in terms of infrastructure to support the previous 800 dwellings and no consideration appears to have been given to this matter for this allocation either.	for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships. No further change proposed.
2208	F041	Ms	Crawford	Bobbing Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0595	Object	Objects to the increase in housing numbers for Swale. It is an unnecessary increase with no thought for supporting infrastructure. Many roads are already congested especially at peak	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								times. Many parishioners cannot get on a doctor or dentist list, and find they need to travel further afield to get these vital services.	the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships. No further change proposed.
2560	F086	Mrs	Bexon	Bredgar Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0682	Object	Objects to the proposed change to Policy HP1. Swale cannot sustain a further increase in housing numbers in addition to the 800 dwellings proposed, subject to further consultation, to be included in the Local Plan; a total of 1,600 dwellings additional to those proposed in the current Deposit Draft Local Plan. Swale has indicated that there will be an increase in densities on existing sites to accommodate the initial increase of 800 dwellings, if these are included in the local plan. This will lead to densities of housing provision which would be inappropriate for the Borough; densities at a level common to inner city developments. Housing growth in Swale is currently being driven not outwards from the centre of the urban areas but from the urban and rural fringes into the urban centres. The result is low density development in the urban centres and high density development on the urban fringes. This	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								is a contradiction as a planning model, where services and infrastructure are and should be designed to function outwards from the centre of urban areas. Any additional housing allocation, according to Swale's planning department, would require new sites to be identified which would most certainly be in the rural and therefore greenfield areas. Swale has a poor record in the creation of employment opportunities, historically one job being created for approximately every two dwellings developed. Currently significant numbers of Swale's workforce, especially from Faversham and the Isle of Sheppey, commute out of Swale. The effect on the existing transport infrastructure is apparent. It is not apparent that investment in the necessary infrastructure has been planned which would be required to sustain housing allocation additional to that proposed in the Deposit Draft Local Plan.	period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships. No further change proposed.
212	F082	Dr	Newport	CPRE Kent	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0674	Object	The increase in allocation for Swale is a cause for significant concern. The high level of provision of homes in the interests of meeting the targets of the Thames Gateway is inappropriate in a large rural district at the extreme east of the Thames Gateway growth area. The rural areas of Swale have very little in common with the areas urgently in need of regeneration at the western extreme of the Thames Gateway, and the loss of green field land while there is so much brown field land elsewhere in the growth area can not be considered sustainable. Strongly believes that the regeneration of urban and brownfield areas should be prioritised over the loss of greenfield. Furthermore, maintains the view that the targets for the growth area should not be rigorously enforced on a district by district basis. Where there is such clear scope to increase the housing density, where appropriate, in more urban areas, there should be a corresponding reduction in the demands placed on more rural areas where greenfield land is at risk. Development must under no circumstances be allowed to proceed ahead of the provision of	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The Councils share the concerns regarding the relationship between development and necessary community

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								infrastructure to support that growth. The current drought facing Kent and Medway now makes it more important that the seemingly ever-increasing pressure to increase the supply of new homes is not allowed to continue unchecked. Assurances given by the water companies that water resources will be in balance or possibly surplus (subject to certain conditions being met) seem increasingly hollow in the face of their current inability to supply existing demand without placing significant demands on the aquatic environment. Some of these conditions are no closer to being achieved than they were at the start of the process of producing the KMSP. Future weather predictions indicate that an increase in the frequency of dry winters may well prevent a strategic supply source such as Broadoak from ever achieving its potential. Heavy reliance on such an uncertain future strategic source, and on efficiency measures which have yet to materialise, must not be allowed to underpin a level of development which can not be supported. Requests that modifications to Policy HP1 are deleted.	and social infrastructure. Other policies of the Plan e.g. SS1, QL13 and IMP1 address these relationships. The planning strategy, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency reflects a twin track approach to water resources which includes the potential development of new resources during the plan period. The Plan also incorporates new and robust policies for the efficient use of resources including water and promotes sustainable construction. No further change proposed
2445	F095	Mr	Addicot	Hartlip Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0701	Object	Objects to the increase in the housing allocation for Swale and has concerns that the increase in numbers will lead to the use of greenfield sites.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
3702	F091	Mr	Wilks	Iwade Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0692	Object	Objects to the increased provision of housing for Swale from 8,300 to 9,100 dwellings. Refers to PPG3, para 23 which advocates a target of 60% of additional housing to be on previously developed land and conversion of existing buildings by 2008. Para 4.78 of the emerging Swale Local Plan states that the current requirement of new building will only meet the requirement of the KMSP housing target of 30% previously developed land. This includes housing sites which fall within the flood risk area. Objects to further allocation of greenfield land which is not already included in the Structure Plan and emerging Swale Local Plan. A further major concern is the shortage of fresh water which is continuously brought to our attention by the water companies. Does not believe that this is a temporary situation and that global warming and its effect on our climate is being ignored by Government and at all levels by the Planning Authorities. The older parts of Iwade Village and some of the newer houses suffer poor water pressure at peak hours.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. The 60% target for the use of previously developed land is a national and regional target. It is for the local planning authorities to determine the appropriate target for their areas taking account of the level of housing provision to be accommodated and its distribution and the policy priority attached to the use of previously developed land. Development of the Plan's strategy throughout has taken account of the advice of the Environment Agency as the statutory adviser to local authorities on water resource matters. No further change proposed.
1093	F001	Mr	Watkins	Kitewood Estates	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0524	Object	Proposed increase in housing provision for Swale of 800 dwellings between 2006 and 2016 is too low in view of the extent of residential land identified in the Swale Local Plan Urban Capacity Study and the strategic role of	The EIP Panel recommendation for Swale was that Policy HP1 be increased by 2,200 dwellings. In this the Panel relied on evidence to the EIP that the emerging Swale Local Plan

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								Sittingbourne and the Isle of Sheppey following the completion of the new bridge to the Island. It is suggested that the figure should be increased by at least an additional 200 dwellings per year i.e. an extra 2,000 dwellings from 2006 to 2016.	allocated some 2,200 dwellings more than the Deposit KMSP Policy HP1 quantity. This evidence, and the draft local plan itself also indicate that this apparent extra capacity does not take account of issues of timing and delivery, particularly with regard to the large scale urban regeneration sites at Sittingbourne and Queenborough/ Rushenden that the Structure Plan itself proposes (in Policy NK3). This consideration is of added significance given the Panel's view (which has been accepted by the Councils) that the housing provision policy should extend only to 2016 and not 2021 as originally proposed. The Panel did not propose the identification within the Structure Plan of further strategic sites to augment housing supply – their view would appear to have been that policy provision should relate to the supply identified. Achievement of a policy figure based on the total housing land supply capacity would require full completion by 2016 of all the sites concerned and particularly the major strategic sites. Assessment of housing capacity, reflected in the Swale Local Plan, indicates that three of these sites – Milton Creek Sittingbourne, Queenborough Creek/ Rushenden Road and East Hall Farm Sittingbourne have a collective capacity of some 2400 dwellings respectively but that delivery of almost 1000 dwellings of this capacity is anticipated beyond the period addressed by the Structure Plan i.e. to 2016. On this basis alone the increase of 2,200 dwellings referred to by the Panel would be reduced to c. 1200 dwellings. There is significant headroom between the housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan 2003 and current

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									understanding of capacity even allowing for longer term delivery (post 2016) of a significant element of this. Taking account of deliverability considerations and the focus of Policy HP1 on the pre 2016 period an addition of 1600 dwellings to the provision for Swale 2001-2016 responds to the level and sources of potential land supply, the likely delivery of the strategic development opportunities identified (in Policy NK3) and the scope to make efficient use of land identified for development. No further change proposed
2471	F044	Mrs	Jordan	Rodmersham Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0600	Object	Opposes the addition of a further 800 dwellings in Swale, which would bring total additional dwellings to 1,600 since September 2005. According to Swale Borough Council these additional homes cannot be accommodated in the local plan without identifying more green fields for development.	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. No further change proposed.
118	F088	Mr	Lloyd	Swale Borough Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0685	Object	Objects to the further increase in housing for Swale Borough. The Borough Council is extremely disappointed that the Councils have agreed to a further increase in the housing provision for Swale, especially as the objectors to the first proposed modification raise no new arguments as to why the housing numbers should be increased. It	The Further Modification was proposed in response to outstanding objections from Government that the housing provision for Swale should go beyond the increase of 800 originally proposed given the EIP Panel recommendation for an increase of 2,200. The Councils have reluctantly accepted

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								remains the Borough Council's strong view that the Panel's recommendation is seriously flawed and that it clearly misunderstood the nature of the housing land supply in the Borough, and that a significant proportion of the 2,200 dwellings referred to will not be available until after 2016. As a consequence, and despite the Panel's view to the contrary, this further increase in housing for Swale will mean that an additional, and greenfield, housing site will need to be released. The Borough Council is also concerned, with the continued reliance that the objectors place on the Inter-Regional Planning Statement, which has no statutory status and is intended to inform the preparation of the SE Plan, and to be tested through that process. The Borough Council is further concerned that in responding to the objectors, and agreeing this further increase, the Councils make no reference to the impact that an increase in housing will have on the balance between employment and housing that both the Structure Plan and Local Plan seek to achieve. The Borough Council is concerned that this balance will be seriously undermined by the drive towards increasing housing provision. This is a point that the Council has strongly made through the sub-regional work for the SE Plan, identifying a clear need for additional employment land to be provided. At best, therefore, it is premature to increase housing requirement now in advance of the SE Plan when both issues can be considered hand in hand.	some further increase although not to the full extent indicated by the EIP Panel. Whilst acknowledging that there is significant headroom between the original housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan and current understanding of housing capacity much depends on the deliverability of this capacity within the time horizon of the Structure Plan (now reduced to 2016). It is accepted that the revised housing quantity will require some addition to the land supply for the period to 2016. It is agreed that the Inter Regional Planning statement has no statutory status. The testing of housing provision for Swale to 2016 has however been effected through the Structure Plan process. The comments regarding the balance of housing and employment provision are noted. It is not clear how far this consideration was taken into account in either the EIP Panel recommendation for the level of housing provision in Swale or Government's view on the level proposed in the initial modifications round. No further change proposed.
619	F073	Mr	Lewis	Trenport Investments Limited c/o Vincent & Gorbing	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0659	Object	Generally supports the proposed increase in the housing distribution figures for Swale. However, the increase should be greater for the following reasons: 1. EIP Panel's Recommendation – Panel recommended that an additional 2,200 dwellings should be added to Swale provision, thereby increasing the 2001 to 2016 requirement to 9,700, which is more than the 9,100 currently proposed. Provision should be increased to reflect the Panel's recommendation. 2. Comparison with adopted Structure Plan	The EIP Panel recommendation for Swale was that Policy HP1 be increased by 2,200 dwellings. In this the Panel relied on evidence to the EIP that the emerging Swale Local Plan allocated some 2,200 dwellings more than the Deposit KMSP Policy HP1 quantity. This evidence, and the draft local plan itself also indicate that this apparent extra capacity does not take account of issues of timing and delivery, particularly with regard to the

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								housing provision - (see original response for comparison table). The Further Proposed Modifications propose a significant reduction in housing provision in Swale compared to the adopted Structure Plan with 800 less 2001 to 2006, and 600 less 2006 to 2011, and effectively means that only 1,800 houses are to be provided in Swale 2001 to 2016 over and above existing requirements. This substantial reduction in provision does not reflect the 'step change' increase in the SE sought by the Government in the Sustainable Communities Plan and growth areas in particular. Effectively the opposite is being proposed in Swale. 3. Local Plan Review - The Re-Deposit Local Plan makes allocations for 4,703 dwellings (Policy H5), which when added to completions, permissions and windfalls (para 4.76) makes a total of some 10,556 dwellings, which is more than proposed in the Further Proposed Modifications. There does not appear to be any sound reason why the Structure Plan should hold back housing provision in Swale, when the housing provision is effectively already proposed to be allocated, particularly bearing in mind the location in a growth area and the need for a 'step change' increase in housing. The Proposed Modifications should be amended as follows: 2001 to 2006 provision increased to 3,500 as per KSP 1996; 2006 to 2011 provision increased to 3,800 as KSP 1996 (note: retain 3,200 suggested in Further Proposed Modifications, and to reflect the proposed Local Plan review allocations); Total period 2001 to 2016 increased to 10,500. If completions in the period 2001 to 2006 do not meet the suggested provision the totals for the following plan periods should be increased accordingly in order to avoid under provision.	large scale urban regeneration sites at Sittingbourne and Queenborough/ Rushenden that the Structure Plan itself proposes (in Policy NK3). This consideration is of added significance given the Panel's view (which has been accepted by the Councils) that the housing provision policy should extend only to 2016 and not 2021 as originally proposed. The Panel did not propose the identification within the Structure Plan of further strategic sites to augment housing supply – their view would appear to have been that policy provision should relate to the supply identified. Achievement of a policy figure based on the total housing land supply capacity would require full completion by 2016 of all the sites concerned and particularly the major strategic sites. Assessment of housing capacity, reflected in the Swale Local Plan, indicates that three of these sites – Milton Creek Sittingbourne, Queenborough Creek/ Rushenden Road and East Hall Farm Sittingbourne have a collective capacity of some 2400 dwellings respectively but that delivery of almost 1000 dwellings of this capacity is anticipated beyond the period addressed by the Structure Plan i.e. to 2016. On this basis alone the increase of 2,200 dwellings referred to by the Panel would be reduced to c. 1200 dwellings. There is significant headroom between the housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan 2003 and current understanding of capacity even allowing for longer term delivery (post 2016) of a significant element of this. Taking account of deliverability considerations and the focus of Policy HP1 on the pre 2016 period an addition of 1600 dwellings to the provision for

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									Swale 2001-2016 would respond to the level and sources of potential land supply, the likely delivery of the strategic development opportunities identified (in Policy NK3) and the scope to make efficient use of land identified for development. It would provide a realistic response to the concerns of Government and others in the context of the housing capacity considerations discussed above. At this level some further addition to land supply for the short term is nonetheless implied. No further change proposed.
692	F075	Mr	Copsey	Ward Homes Ltd c/o David Lock Associates	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0664	Object	The housing figure of 9,100 fails to reflect the full development potential within Swale identified within the Re-Deposit Draft Local Plan. Calculations (see original response) show total residual supply as 2,071 dwellings. Therefore an additional 2,100 dwellings should be allocated to Swale (rounded up), giving a total of 9,600 dwellings. This is in keeping with the recommendations of the Panel Report and requires Policy HP1 to be amended to show a further 500 dwellings being directed to Swale Borough. Given the role of Swale within the Thames Gateway Growth Area and the need to deliver a step change in housing supply, there is no justification for only increasing the supply by 1,600 dwellings and writing off 500 dwellings identified within an emerging Local Plan/LDF. Take issue with the assertion that no further strategic sites were identified. The Panel did note (para 9.113) the potential for increased densities at Iwade to be considered as part of the LDD process. Note the lack of discussion of the potential for increased densities at Iwade as identified by para 9.113 of the Panel Report within the Report of Consultation on the Proposed Modifications (December 2005). Again request that a footnote should be added to Policy HP1 noting the potential for increased densities at Iwade to be considered as part of the LDD process. Also request that the consideration of this request be fully addressed	The EIP Panel recommendation for Swale was that Policy HP1 be increased by 2,200 dwellings. In this the Panel relied on evidence to the EIP that the emerging Swale Local Plan allocated some 2,200 dwellings more than the Deposit KMSP Policy HP1 quantity. This evidence, and the draft local plan itself also indicate that this apparent extra capacity does not take account of issues of timing and delivery, particularly with regard to the large scale urban regeneration sites at Sittingbourne and Queenborough/ Rushenden that the Structure Plan itself proposes (in Policy NK3). This consideration is of added significance given the Panel's view (which has been accepted by the Councils) that the housing provision policy should extend only to 2016 and not 2021 as originally proposed. The Panel did not propose the identification within the Structure Plan of further strategic sites to augment housing supply – their view would appear to have been that policy provision should relate to the supply identified. Achievement of a policy figure based on the total housing land supply capacity would require full completion by 2016 of all the sites

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								by any subsequent reporting of this representation. In view of the above, the housing figure for Swale in Policy HP1 should be increased by a further 500 dwellings, to 9,600 dwellings 2001-2016 and a footnote added noting the potential for increased densities at Iwade to be considered as part of the LDD process.	concerned and particularly the major strategic sites. Assessment of housing capacity, reflected in the Swale Local Plan, indicates that three of these sites – Milton Creek Sittingbourne, Queenborough Creek/ Rushenden Road and East Hall Farm Sittingbourne have a collective capacity of some 2400 dwellings respectively but that delivery of almost 1000 dwellings of this capacity is anticipated beyond the period addressed by the Structure Plan i.e. to 2016. On this basis alone the increase of 2,200 dwellings referred to by the Panel would be reduced to c. 1200 dwellings. There is significant headroom between the housing quantity in the Deposit Structure Plan 2003 and current understanding of capacity even allowing for longer term delivery (post 2016) of a significant element of this. Taking account of deliverability considerations and the focus of Policy HP1 on the pre 2016 period an addition of 1600 dwellings to the provision for Swale 2001-2016 would respond to the level and sources of potential land supply, the likely delivery of the strategic development opportunities identified (in Policy NK3) and the scope to make efficient use of land identified for development. It would provide a realistic response to the concerns of Government and others in the context of the housing capacity considerations discussed above. At this level some further addition to land supply for the short term is nonetheless implied. Iwade is identified by the Structure Plan as a strategic development location for 1200 dwellings. The EIP Panel noted that any increase on this figure achieved by way of increased densities is 'essentially a Local Plan/LDD matter'. It will be open to Swale BC to consider

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									this option along with others in determining the approach to achieving the higher Policy HP1 housing quantities proposed in the KMSP modifications. No further change proposed.

FPMOD 7.1
Policy HP1 (Housing Provision and Distribution 2001-2016): Other

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
975	F081	J A	Bradbury	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0673	Object	Alarmed to see that while more housing is proposed for the area no one seems to be concerned with water supplies. This problem becomes more and more serious as the years go by. Requests that planners should call a halt to house building until the water supply is made adequate.	The planning strategy, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency, reflects a twin track approach to water resources which includes the potential development of new resources during the plan period. The Plan also incorporates new and robust policies for the efficient use of resources including water and promotes sustainable construction. No further change proposed.
3229	F021	Mr	Smith	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0561	Object	The proposed figures in increased housing in the County of Kent, that is already overcrowded, are beyond all reason of common sense.	The proposed increases stem directly from recommendations for changes to Policy HP1 made to the Councils by the Examination in Public Panel. No further change proposed.
1076	F056	Mr	Murr	Medway Countryside Forum	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0624	Object	The wording of the modifications to Policies HP1 and HP2a place undue emphasis on growth, and that in referring to the identification and release of sites for housing development, the presumption that previously developed sites will be used before greenfield sites is qualified by the term "generally". In the reason for FPMOD 7.2, it is stated that the release of sites for housing development must ensure that growth area requirements are met. It is the presumption in the housing policies in the Plan that growth should be encouraged as a principle which is a distortion of the needs of the area. In interpreting and carrying forward the	The prioritisation of previously developed land for development is embedded within the Structure Plan and Policy HP2a gives effect to the sequential consideration of sites to secure this subject to development locations meeting other criteria for sustainably located development. There may be circumstances e.g. in the Ashford growth area where both greenfield and previously developed land options need to be brought forward in parallel to deliver the requirements established for areas of

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								Thames Gateway Strategy, there has been a regrettable change of emphasis towards growth rather than renewal or regeneration, and a parallel dilution of that part of the strategy which gave importance to resisting the outward expansion of urban areas. This applies particularly to the Medway area, where the housing policies will mean significant loss of locally valued countryside. In the rest of Kent, it is clear that the progressive loss of greenfield land, and significant expansion of built areas into their rural hinterland, will continue under the provisions of the modified plan.	higher housing growth such as the regional growth areas. Provision for growth in Kent Thames Gateway reflects a strategy of realising large scale regeneration opportunities involving previously developed or other damaged land. Notwithstanding the level of housing provision for Kent and the presence of two regional growth areas in the county the plan incorporates a target that 70% of housing provision to 2016 is provided from previously developed sites or previously used buildings. No further change proposed.
992	F050	Ms	Cook	Thames Water Property Services	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0616	Object	Thames Water is the utility service provider for part of Kent and Medway. Would therefore like the following to be taken into account due to the increase in the number of dwellings: May require up to a three year lead in time for provision of extra capacity to supply and drain new development sites. If any large engineering works are needed to upgrade infrastructure the lead in time could be up to five years and the process to implement new treatment works or reservoirs could take between eight and ten years. New development may therefore need to be phased to allow the prior completion of the necessary infrastructure.	The planning strategy, taking account of advice from the Environment Agency, reflects a twin track approach to water resources which includes the potential development of new resources during the plan period. Plan policies provide for the balanced and timely development of necessary infrastructure alongside development (Policy SS1). In the Thames Water area within Kent there are phasing provisions relating to water resources included within Policy NK1. No further change proposed.
692	F075	Mr	Copsey	Ward Homes Ltd c/o David Lock Associates	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0663	Object	Objects to the lack of a note to Policy HP1 setting out the expectation of RPG/RSS coming forward with an increase in provision post 2016 for the Region including Kent and Medway. This was a recommendation of the Panel at Chapter 4 of the Panel Report.	The expectation within RPG/RSS9 is that housing provision within the region as a whole would increase beyond 2006 not 2016. The housing provision within the KMSP for the post 2006 period equates to 6480 homes per annum – this is 14% above the rate for Kent set out in RSS/RPG9 5,700 per annum). No further change proposed.
1892	F003	Mr	Bearn	Favoured Locations Ltd	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0528	Support	It is realistic.	Support noted.

FPMOD 7.2
Policy HP2a (Housing Provision: Phasing, Assessment and Sequential Approach to Location)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2246	F040	Ms	Simpson	CPRE (Maidstone District)	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0594	Object	Objects to elements in this policy which seek to reduce the emphasis generally on the use for new housing of previously developed brownfield sites before housing is permitted on greenfield sites. In A, while the original policy states "the LPAs will phase and manage the release of sites for housing development to ensure that generally . . . Previously developed sites are brought forward before greenfield sites", the FPMOD 7.2 version states "generally, previously developed sites are identified before greenfield sites". The weakening of the significance of brownfield land for development is given strength by the statement in the Reason: "that prioritisation of previously developed land relates to the sequential identification of sites and not necessarily the sequence of land release amongst the sites identified". Previously developed brownfield land, which is genuinely such land and not part green land which should be protected by other planning considerations, should be developed for housing before greenfield land. The third bullet point in FPMOD 7.1A does not offer sufficient protection for the green land, whether it is open space within urban/suburban areas or the open, rural countryside. There must be a land bank for at least 5 years, and so there will be discussion of which land should be included. The opening statement of B confirms this approach as it contains the wording "the suitability of both previously developed and greenfield sites for housing development should demonstrate . . ." As stated in comments on FPMOD 7.1, once developers think green land might be available before brown land, they will concentrate on developing that green land. The quality of the regeneration of previously developed land will be lower and the community of existing and new residents will suffer a poorer quality of life.	The modifications do not weaken the emphasis on previously developed land They do make clear that all sites, whether greenfield or brownfield, need to meet other criteria for sustainably located development and that there is a distinction between the priorities followed in identifying sites and the mix of sites that may need to be released within any period of the Plan in order to meet the housing quantities for that period. The prioritisation of previously developed land for development is embedded within the Structure Plan and Policy HP2a gives effect to the sequential consideration of sites to secure this subject to development locations meeting other criteria for sustainably located development. There may be circumstances where both greenfield and previously developed land options need to be brought forward in parallel to deliver the requirements established for the area. Phasing provisions within local plans/ LDDs will need to establish the extent to which previously developed land identified is sufficient to accommodate the phased housing provisions within Policy HP1. The role and significance of district level housing allocations is unchanged as a result of the provisions of HP2a. No further change proposed.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								Does not object to the introductory wording of A, nor to the first two bullets, but they do not tie in with FPMOD 7.1 should that continue to be revised to contain figures for Maidstone housing to 2016 qualified as minimum. In C, it is evident that the district allocation of housing numbers is given added significance by the removal of "Kent" (in the sense of Kent-wide and not just within Kent) in C1a) and b). Would have more sympathy with this view were it not for the draft revision proposals for PPS3 to make any references to the "relevant sub-regional housing market area", and for LDFs (District basis) "to be in conformity. . . with the regional spatial strategy". So much for local consultation and local democracy! It might appear that C1), 2) and 3) strengthen the concept of the sequential development of previously developed land, concentrating first on the reuse of such land and the buildings thereon. However, that sequential approach is much weakened by the new third bullet point in A. Would prefer the deletion of all of the new wording for A and the reinstatement of the original wording. However, would settle for the deletion of the third bullet point "generally, previously developed sites are identified before greenfield sites" and the reinstatement of the original "generally, previously developed sites are brought forward before greenfield sites".	
212	F082	Dr	Newport	CPRE Kent	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0676	Object	Reservations regarding the district-by-district allocation of housing numbers, particularly with regard to the Thames Gateway, remain. Contented that the Growth Area targets for the Thames Gateway can be accommodated on brownfield land, and moreover, that focusing on brownfield sites where appropriate provides the best opportunity for urban regeneration and for limiting greenfield sprawl. However, where targets can be accommodated on brownfield land, there must be a corresponding reduction in demand on greenfield sites. This principle should apply throughout Kent and Medway, and not only in the growth areas. Disagree with the EIP Panel's comments that	District housing provisions, once determined, should be met within the district concerned. However the scale and distribution of opportunities for the use of previously developed land have influenced the approach to housing distribution across Kent (Deposit Plan para 7.7). Within individual districts prioritisation of previously developed land should be pursued within the framework set by the overall housing quantity which must be met in local plan/LDD provisions. The planning strategy, taking account of advice from the Environment

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								development targets for each district must be met individually. Protection of greenfield land must take priority over district-by-district housing targets. Suggests that the clause ". . Generally, previously developed sites are identified before greenfield sites. . ." should be elevated to take priority over the district-by-district and year-on-year phasing of site release. Have particular concerns with regard to the prospect of extreme water shortages across Kent and the wider South East in the future. Comments relating to water status and the timely provision of infrastructure as outlined in response to FPMOD 7.1 (Policy HP1) also apply here. With the above reservations, support the modifications to the remainder of the policy (clauses B and C).	Agency, reflects a twin track approach to water resources which includes the potential development of new resources during the plan period. The Plan also incorporates new and robust policies for the efficient use of resources including water and promotes sustainable construction. No further change proposed.
1076	F056	Mr	Murr	Medway Countryside Forum	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0625	Object	The wording of the modifications to Policies HP1 and HP2a place undue emphasis on growth, and that in referring to the identification and release of sites for housing development, the presumption that previously developed sites will be used before greenfield sites is qualified by the term "generally". In the reason for FPMOD 7.2, it is stated that the release of sites for housing development must ensure that growth area requirements are met. It is the presumption in the housing policies in the Plan that growth should be encouraged as a principle which is a distortion of the needs of the area. In interpreting and carrying forward the Thames Gateway Strategy, there has been a regrettable change of emphasis towards growth rather than renewal or regeneration, and a parallel dilution of that part of the strategy which gave importance to resisting the outward expansion of urban areas. This applies particularly to the Medway area, where the housing policies will mean significant loss of locally valued countryside. In the rest of Kent, it is clear that the progressive loss of greenfield land, and significant expansion of built areas into their rural hinterland, will continue under the provisions of the modified plan.	The prioritisation of previously developed land for development is embedded within the Structure Plan and Policy HP2a gives effect to the sequential consideration of sites to secure this subject to development locations meeting other criteria for sustainably located development. There may be circumstances e.g. in the Ashford growth area where both greenfield and previously developed land options need to be brought forward in parallel to deliver the requirements established for areas of higher housing growth such as the regional growth areas. Provision for growth in Kent Thames Gateway reflects a strategy of realising large scale regeneration opportunities involving previously developed or other damaged land. Notwithstanding the level of housing provision for Kent and the presence of two regional growth areas in the county the plan incorporates a target that 70% of housing provision to 2016 is provided from previously developed sites or previously used buildings.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
									No further change proposed.
2644	F067	Mr	Warren	Medway Magna c/o Graham Warren Partnership	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0643	Object	Objected in letter dated 9 October 2005 (copy enclosed with original representation) and still maintain an objection because the specific recommendations of the Panel continue to be ignored. Panel's concern was that paras 30 and 31 of PPG3 were not being properly reflected. Para 30 clearly identifies urban extensions as the preferred choice after previously developed land within the urban areas. Moreover, in identifying "new development" as third preference it adds the qualification that they are to be at "nodes in good public transport corridors". The modification does not follow guidance in PPG3 or the advice of the Panel in part 4 of its report. No reasoned justification is set out for these departures, nor are the potential results of doing so examined. The modification is therefore unreasonable and may be subject to challenge. Further confusion arises because the search sequence in C3 of the policy places extensions to the major/principal urban area behind strategic development locations identified in the Plan. The effect is to give major/principal urban areas a lower priority for search than strategic development locations. C2 and C3 of the policy should be juxtaposed to properly reflect government advice. Maintain that the proper response to the Panel's recommendation and GOSE's objection to this aspect of the Proposed Modifications should be to have the policy structured in the manner set out in letter of 9 October 2005. This would recognise that new free standing settlements, of the size that is practical in Kent and Medway, are unable to provide facilities and services of sufficient scale to achieve sustainability, whereas major urban extensions make use of existing facilities and services and when well planned, can supplement them, thus securing the objectives of sustainable development. The approach now proposed is also prejudicial to Policy SS1 that prioritises areas for development and investment by focussing on the major urban areas. HP2a, in still placing	The Policy is felt to be fully consistent with PPG3. PPG3 does not define urban areas in terms of scale or function but relates them to settlements covered by urban capacity studies. The expectation is that rural service centres and indeed other potentially sustainable settlements beyond the major/principal urban areas would be covered by urban capacity studies in accordance with the Kent Protocol. Any sites identified through this process would be subject to the assessment against the criteria in Part B of HP2a which reflect the nationally prescribed criteria in para 31 of PPG3. Dwelling yield from sites within rural service centres and other sustainable settlements is likely to be modest in any one district and unlikely to supplant a requirement for strategic scale development through an urban extension. The strategic development locations have been scrutinised and endorsed through the Structure Plan process including its EIP. It is thus appropriate that they are taken forward in the development of planning strategy for individual districts in local plans/LDDs. No further change proposed.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								emphasis on the rural service centres, is contrary to the thrust of SS1. Cannot understand why the Plan is proposed to be formulated in a way that causes confusion in respect of a perfectly clear search sequence set out in Government guidance. In failing to have proper regard to higher authority guidance, the Plan leaves itself open to legal challenge.	
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0550	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0607	Support	Very anxious that any development does not harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	Support noted.
1205	F093	Ms	Grant	Church Commissioners for England c/o DTZ Debenham Tie Leung	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0698	Support	Supportive of the operation of the sequential test and the overarching emphasis on bringing forward previously developed land in advance of greenfield land. Do, however, believe that a successful strategy for delivering a step change in the supply of housing will necessarily encompass both previously developed and greenfield land, particularly in the growth areas. Therefore concerned that the amended Policy HP2a, as currently drafted, may restrict the timely development of deliverable and sustainable greenfield sites on the basis of incorrect and unrealistic assumptions about windfalls and previously developed land generally. Flexibility should be employed on a site by site basis and should also take account of the timescale for the availability of windfall and brownfield sites, the latter of which often have complex land assembly issues associated with them.	Support noted. The prioritisation of previously developed land for development is embedded within the Structure Plan and Policy HP2a gives effect to the sequential consideration of sites to secure this subject to development locations meeting other criteria for sustainably located development. There may be circumstances e.g. in the Ashford growth area where both greenfield and previously developed land options need to be brought forward in parallel to deliver the phased housing requirements in the Plan.
1892	F003	Mr	Bearn	Favoured Locations Ltd	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0529	Support	Achieves greater clarity.	Support noted.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
1120	F038	Miss	Mills	Kingsnorth Parish Council	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0589	Support	Supports the changes in FPMOD 7.2.	Support noted.

FPMOD 8.1
Policy TP3 & Table TP3 (Safeguarding of Programmed Strategic Transport Schemes)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
1624	F012	A H T	Chalaye	.	FPMOD 8.1 (TP3)	M-0539	Support	-	Support noted.
118	F088	Mr	Lloyd	Swale Borough Council	FPMOD 8.1 (TP3)	M-0686	Support	The Borough Council supports FPMOD 8.1.	Support noted.
619	F073	Mr	Lewis	Trenport Investments Limited c/o Vincent & Gorbing	FPMOD 8.1 (TP3)	M-0660	Support	Supports the Further Proposed Modification, which helps to clarify the position on the Northern Distributor Road, although a start date of 2005/6 is very optimistic. Understand from discussions with the County that the earliest start date for the sections of the road between Ridham Avenue and East Hall Farm is likely to be January 2008. There is an 18 month contract period and earliest completion date would be the middle of 2009.	Support noted.

FPMOD 8.2
Policy TP4 (Support for Strategic Rail Schemes)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
1624	F012	A H T	Chalaye	.	FPMOD 8.2 (TP4)	M-0540	Support	-	Support noted.
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 8.2 (TP4)	M-0551	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.

FPMOD 8.3
Policy TP5 & Table TP5 (Major Transport Corridors)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
1624	F012	A H T	Chalaye	.	FPMOD 8.3 (TP5)	M-0541	Support	-	Support noted.
3512	F014	M H	Stranks	.	FPMOD 8.3 (TP5)	M-0552	Support	Proposals appear to be sensible.	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 8.3 (TP5)	M-0608	Support	Very anxious that any development does not harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	Support noted.

FPMOD 8.4
Policy TP7 & Table TP7 (Future Strategic Transport Schemes)

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
2142	F026	Mrs	Brockman	Faversham Town Council	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0572	Object	The reference to the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road should be amended to read: "Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road (between East Hall Farm, the A2 and with a connection with the M2 Motorway", in order to agree with the comments contained in relation to this road in the Swale Local Plan.	The concept of the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road as considered through the Structure Plan process has been the provision of a link between the A249 and the A2. No further change proposed.
1076	F056	Mr	Murr	Medway Countryside Forum	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0626	Object	Objection relates to the lack of clarity in the statement "schemes may be funded partially or fully by development". With the huge pressures for growth in Kent and the Thames Gateway there is a danger that road schemes, particularly major projects such as additional river crossings, will be promoted in support of a continuing influx	Where there is a direct relationship between development justified as part of the planning strategy for an area and the provision of specific transport infrastructure it may be appropriate that this be wholly or partially funded by the development concerned.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								of development rather than as transport solutions. There is also some uncertainty about the reference to Transport for Medway as to whether Medway Council is supportive of a Lower Thames Crossing. While this is not referred to in Table TP7, it has been listed as a possible future road scheme in Medway's Provisional Transport Plan, "critical for catering for growth in the Thames Gateway". Such a scheme would not only have a hugely damaging environmental impact but would conflict with the Government's claim to be pursuing sustainable transport strategies. A massive expansion of this road network affecting North Kent and Medway would surely conflict with Policies TP0 and TP1 in the KMSP. It would generate further pressure for large scale development, and encourage a massive increase in road use and commuting.	The Councils position regarding a Lower Thames Crossing is as stated in policy TP6 of the Plan i.e. that the need for and location of a multi modal crossing of the Thames should be urgently investigated by Government. No further change proposed.
1624	F012	A H T	Chalaye	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0542	Support	-	Support noted.
3418	F046	Mr & Mrs	Teale	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0609	Support	Very anxious that any development does not harm wildlife, infringe on greenfield sites and increase congestion in our already congested environment. There is no point providing extra housing if our existing services are unable to cope with the extra volume of people and traffic. A number of people are increasingly concerned that large scale housing development will encroach on the rural towns making them suburbs of large towns. If people living in rural villages and towns wanted the busy town lifestyle they wouldn't have opted to live out of town.	Support noted.
2217	F051	Mr	Mackenzie	H + H Celcon Ltd c/o Barton Willmore	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0617	Support	Supports the reinstatement of the reference that certain strategic transport schemes may be funded partially or fully by development. The delivery of the A227 (A25) Borough Green and Platt Bypass is an important aim of the KMSP under Policy TP7 and Table TP7 and is dependent upon funding by development. Such development is provided in the extant proposals accompanied by an environmental statement by H + H Celcon Ltd for a second factory at Borough Green Ref: TM/03/2563 which includes	Support noted.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								the necessary funding and the provision of land for the delivery of the Bypass. Explicit support of such development should be provided under Structure Plan policy.	
3699	F084	Mr	Lander	Redrow Homes/Taylor Woodrow/David Wilson Homes c/o Boyer Planning Ltd	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0679	Support	The continued inclusion of the Leeds-Langley bypass within the Plan will ensure sustainable growth within Maidstone, and around its periphery, and is welcomed. Expedient access to the national motorway network should encourage additional investment within the town, strengthening its position within the County's hierarchy as one of the main settlements. It must be noted that the early delivery of this transport scheme will aid continued growth in the town, through delivery of allocated sites.	Support noted.
118	F088	Mr	Lloyd	Swale Borough Council	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0687	Support	The Borough Council supports FPMOD 8.4.	Support noted.
619	F073	Mr	Lewis	Trenport Investments Limited c/o Vincent & Gorbing	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0661	Support	Supports the Further Proposed Modification, which helps to clarify the position on the Northern Distributor Road.	Support noted.

Comments that are "Not Valid"

The following comments have been logged as "Not Valid" as they do not relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
3322	F002	D	Quinn	.	FPMOD 4.1 (E8)	M-0525	Support	Supports protection and enhancement of wildlife.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3703	F092	Ms	Welch	.	FPMOD 6.2 (FP11)	M-0694	Object	Are conference hotels going to be built or are they refurbishment? If they are new buildings is there a need or is it a way of getting hold of EU money? Has need been demonstrated? These tourist sites amid the out of town sites of bulky stores make it sound like Disney; it seems the idea is to destroy what is natural then create a theme park. Out of town stores should be the rare exception. Urges listening to CPRE as they at least make sense.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3208	F032	Ms	Saunders	.	FPMOD 6.3 (FP14)	M-0577	Object	City and town centres are very much affected by the growth of housing in the local area. The	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								traditional high street is rapidly changing with many superstores being located outside. The need to gain customer access to them is important for development and continued sustainability. It has been shown in many parts of the country that in order to, not only to maintain the (High Street) and out of town store developments, good "park & ride" facilities are needed. Also, it should not be forgotten that not all shoppers have access to cars. So public transport integration is also important. Knows that Policy FP14 is not primarily about transport, but believes that where developments are sited out of town public transport should be considered. A case in point is the way in which Ashford has developed, with many superstores out of town centre. Unfortunately the bus services have not kept pace (except the outlet centre). We are constantly being told to protect the environment and reduce CO2 emissions so every effort should be made to reduce car movements. However, not by pricing them off the road, but by sensible integration with public services. To this end would like to see the following additional words added to FP14: "With the interests of access to and integration with public transport also taken into account".	Proposed Modification.
1079	F011	Dr	Brighton	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0538	Object	Houses need water. Bewl Water is empty. Global warming = less rain. Where is the water treatment (recycling) and desalination? People expect medical facilities. Medway has suffered from low assessment of population numbers and long waiting lists at Medway Hospital. Does the 2000 Census correct that? Who pays for the Medway Housing Association percent of the build? What social/medical/religious space is allocated per 100 houses? St Mary's Island is a good example of poor policy. Rochester Riverside looks as bad.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3459	F030	Mr	Easton	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0573	Object	Wishes to protest against Folkestone Council's plan to build 85 houses on the flood catchment area on the Dymchurch Road adjacent to the pumping station. This is a unique area which	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								should be preserved. The Romney Marsh and the sea front is special and these houses will only spoil the area.	
2348	F018	Mr	Hoyal	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0556	Object	1. Extra housing revenue goes to overpaid officials. 2. Kent is over housed now, as last time we had a water shortage, it started in Sussex and drained the water table in Kent, and the more houses, lorry parks, etc, built, adds more pressure on resources. Kent with motorways and railways being built is becoming a concrete jungle for what - greed. The houses being built in North Kent do not seem to sell, plus inner London has lots of empty properties. 3. Understood that there was going to be a road built from the M20 to Otterpool (Sellindge) to alleviate the 3 miles of the old A20 and Newingsteen and Lympne. It would also stop lorries using Stone Street and Lympne, which now the chicane is built at Berwick Hill makes it more dangerous.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3015	F036	Ms	Lowden	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0584	Object	Too many houses throughout Kent. Would like to know where all the water for the new homes will come from. Are there any programmes for new reservoirs? This should be made a key priority. Do not want to get like Sussex who are almost out of water.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3500	F004	A P	Prescott	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0530	Object	The housing policy can't be started before a serious debate on improving infrastructure and providing answers to existing problems. Water supplies already inadequate, system unable to cope with increase in residences. Electricity and gas no plan for long term provision at what cost to environment to install connections. One hospital in Ashford area. Parking inadequate, increased waiting lists, emergency services stretched to breaking point. Not enough skilled labour to support all the needs of such a huge scheme.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3363	F008	Mr	Pryde	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0535	Object	Have a hose pipe ban at present. Where will the planners get the extra water.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3322	F002	D	Quinn	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0526	Object	13,100 dwellings at Ashford 2001 to 2016 is far too many. Land will also be required for schools, health care, hospitals, etc.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								1,000 dwellings at Aylesham is too many.	
857	F007	Miss	Russell	.	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0533	Object	Too many houses (flats, apartment blocks particularly) built, being built already (many remain empty or are let anyway) not necessary. Apartment blocks/high rise housing awful. Are not lessons ever learned. Do not want creation of ghettos and building spoiling country landscape and town landscape even. Urban open spaces used so unnecessarily and ruins town landscape also building still being done on floodplains – why.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1222	F024	Mr	Talbot	Ashford Rural Trust	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0564	Object	Thought that the figure for Ashford 2000-2016 should read 31,000.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1228	F037	Mr	Tullett	The Broadstairs Society	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) Other	M-0585	Object	Concerned at number proposed for Thanet – lack of infrastructure, particularly water supplies and sewerage disposal.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
2593	F054	Mr	Huxtable	Newington Parish Council	FPMOD 7.1 (HP1) SW	M-0622	Object	The A2 at Newington carries 13,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day through its 5.2 metre wide High Street which is not wide enough for two HGVs to pass each other. With the proposed building programme for Swale being increased from 8,300 to 9,100 dwellings and the associated increase in commercial activities this will logically increase traffic flows by a corresponding amount. As the proposed total increase in new houses for Swale is at least 10% then at least 10% more traffic will flow through Newington to add to the already impossible burden. Even though the A2 through Newington is not a designated primary route, it is a primary route by usage and probably the busiest single carriageway road in Kent. It is definitely the narrowest, for this volume of traffic, as it passes through Newington High Street. It s therefore, as far as 15,000 drivers are concerned, the primary route. None of the other single carriageway roads mentioned for improvements, upgrades or to include bypasses in Tables TP3, TP5 and TP7 have such a current acute need as the A2 through Newington. As none of the other areas have anywhere near the proposed development as Swale then a bypass of Newington by the A2 becomes ever more compelling. The local	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								demand for a bypass was demonstrated by the 574 for to 4 against responses to a question in the survey carried out as part of the preparatory work for the local Parish Plan. This was in support of the route as generally outlined by KCC. The options therefore are: to significantly reduce the future increase in houses in Swale, or build a Bypass for Newington.	
3625	F005	Mr	Mayhew	.	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0531	Object	Too many new housing developments are being established without sufficient encouragement being made for the supporting infrastructure i.e. sewerage capacity, water supplies, schools, hospitals, and adequate means of supplies i.e. shops locally and local public transport arrangements are not usually adequate. Not enough forethought is given and existing accommodation in town centres above shops are being left vacant and unused.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
857	F007	Miss	Russell	.	FPMOD 7.2 (HP2a)	M-0534	Object	Greenfield space should not be used at all or considered empty. Buildings already standing, unused office blocks in town or on outskirts should be converted. Surely cost wise would be cheaper. Please do not ruin Kent or England for that matter Garden of England (supposedly). Thank you.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1619	F028	Mr	Johnson	.	FPMOD 8.1 (TP3)	M-0569	Support	Desperately require implementation of QL12 Borough Green Bypass. TP1 A21 Bypass also urgent – it should have been implemented long ago but has been set back several times.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1362	F019	Mr	Firbank	.	FPMOD 8.2 (TP4)	M-0557	Support	The provision for future housing will produce increased numbers of passengers travelling by rail to their places of employment in London and surrounding areas. At the present time trains during the rush hours in the morning and evening are overcrowded. If, or when, Crossrail receives Royal assent a wider area of employment may be opened up. However only dedicated full size rail trains will be able to use the Crossrail tunnels as acceleration out of stations must be up to London Underground specification.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1158	F017	Mr	Alton	.	FPMOD 8.3 (TP5)	M-0555	Object	The road structure in Kent is way behind what is required for future prosperity and development in the South East of the County – Dover, Deal in particular. Particularly interested in A2 Lydden-	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								Dover scheme which is now decades behind.	
3686	F043	Mr	Hawkes	Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce	FPMOD 8.3 (TP5)	M-0598	Object	Whilst strongly support the inclusion of the A2 Canterbury Bypass Junctions, objects to their relative low priority compared to other listed projects. These junctions are essential to the regeneration of the economy of the Canterbury District. They will relieve serious congestion on routes across East Kent and will support efforts to encourage inward investment to this part of the region. A start date of post 2011 does not adequately reflect the urgency of this project and therefore advocates a possible start in 2008.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1362	F019	Mr	Firbank	.	FPMOD 8.3 (TP5)	M-0558	Support	M25 Junction 5 improvement Sevenoaks: A direct link between the M26 and A21 trunk road will help reduce the traffic on the M25.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3681	F027	Mr	Ball	High Halden Parish Council	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0568	Object	Objects to failure to address the real issues concerning: 1) the A28 between Ashford and Tenterden – major road improvements required to cope with increased capacity and reduce accident rates. 2) Denton Relief Road – recent alternations and amendments have severely affected the industrial estate road/access route.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1228	F037	Mr	Tullett	The Broadstairs Society	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0586	Object	The Westwood Cross development is causing severe traffic problems at times (will worsen). Relief measures sought for A254 and A256 at the roundabout and elsewhere.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1359	F022	Mr	Almond	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0562	Support	Respondent lives in Borough Green and is aware of the congestion and traffic risk as currently experienced. Good to see the A227(A25) Borough Green & Platt Bypass listed – trust that the work will be done as specified in 2007.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1362	F019	Mr	Firbank	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0559	Support	Also Policy QL12 To support a reduction in traffic in Borough Green, air pollution and traffic noise.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1658	F009	Mr	Frost	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0536	Support	Supports the much needed Borough Green and Platt Bypass.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1619	F028	Mr	Johnson	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0570	Support	Desperately require implementation of QL12 Borough Green Bypass. TP1 A21 Bypass also urgent – it should have been implemented long ago but has been set back several times.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1879	F023	Ms	Murray	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0563	Support	Delighted to note that the Borough Green and St Mary's Platt Bypass remains in place. It is a	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								moot point as to whether or not the scheme should be funded via developer contributions or by County – to those who live locally at any rate!	Proposed Modification.
1586	F013	Mrs	Spong	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0543	Support	Badly need the Borough Green and Platt Bypass. Walks to the village every day and the road is very busy, including very large lorries.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3689	F055	Mrs	Wilkins	.	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0623	Support	Supports the Upper Stone Street improvements and the All Saints Link Road. The south of Maidstone has been in great need of this for many years. Until this road is completed, this area of Maidstone will always look run down. Stone Street is far too narrow for the amount of traffic that uses it. Sheals Crescent can barely cope with all the extra flow of traffic along it now.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1671	F006	Mr	Poulter	Borough Green & Platt Bypass Support Group	FPMOD 8.4 (TP7)	M-0532	Support	Also Policy QL12. Enthusiastic about making the village a cleaner, safer and quieter environment. The slow destruction of the village due to vibrations caused by heavy lorries prompted the respondent into supporting the By-Pass support group. Overjoyed that this vital road improvement is scheduled to take place in 2007.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
2865	F010	Mr & Mrs	Corbett	.	FPMOD General	M-0537	Object	Appears to be vast house and road building plans but no mention of schools, hospitals, sewage, water supplies, local shops or community centres. Not everyone has a car and these facilities must be stretched to capacity now.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3459	F030	Mr & Mrs	Easton	.	FPMOD General	M-0574	Object	Strongly opposes the extension to Lydd Airport. Not only noise pollution, air pollution, traffic pollution will increase, peoples lives will be made intolerable by this extra air traffic.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
3477	F085	Mr & Mrs	Ransome	.	FPMOD General	M-0680	Object	Objects to the expansion of Ashford and London Airport known as Lydd Airport. It does not only disrupt the wildlife and peaceful surroundings, it is dangerous being so close to the power station and MOD. There is no viable reason for this to be expanded as the jobs it is supposed to create are or would be minimal. An airport of the size they are after would not work. Just take a look at Manston that has all the relevant roads into it and still failed, but has now been purchased and while we have that so near what is the need for another so close, when we do not have the roads big enough to carry the volume of traffic it	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

Consultee Ref.		Name		Organisation	Further Mod. No.	Com. No.	Sup-Obj	Respondent's Comment	The Councils' Response
								will cause and at cost to ratepayers.	
2142	F026	Mrs	Brockman	Faversham Town Council	FPMOD General	M-0567	Object	No further comments to make other than to endorse the original comments made to the Councils dated 18 October 2005: a) that no peripheral growth for housing be allowed in Faversham. b) that Faversham Town Council would confirm the suggestion that the pre-use of existing sites for business and employment be retained. c) that retail outlets in Kent should be focussed on town centres. d) that consideration be given to the provision of another link from the M2 motorway to the A2 between Faversham and Sittingbourne. e) although Faversham Town Council asked that Faversham should retain its natural boundaries, being Love Lane, the Western Link Road, the A2 and the coast it is felt that the new consultation document considers this issue under peripheral growth. f) Members feel that their request that serious consideration be given to the fact that Faversham has a large commuting population in any strategic rail scheme has not been made clear in the Plan and would ask that this be given further serious consideration to include an indication of routes and to request that peak services be retained which relate to passengers preferred destinations in London as it is felt that a reduced service will have a detrimental effect on the commuter population's employment.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1169	F083	Mr	Winbourne	River Tram Transit Initiatives Ltd	FPMOD General	M-0677	Object	The Councils' reasons for not responding to previous submissions, which in all the circumstances are set out in the enclosed letter to ODPM dated 13 February, are unacceptable albeit on a technicality. (see original response for detail of enclosures) Advises of latest Government consultations on PPS3 and intention of submission of planning applications for the River Tram Ferry system and Phase 1 of the Thamesbridge Estuarial Crossing.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.
1221	F020	Mrs	Hardinges	Southfleet Parish Council	FPMOD General	M-0560	Support	In principle, supports the Further Proposed Modifications as being reasonable means to overcome complex problems.	Respondent's comment does not directly relate to a specific Further Proposed Modification.

2. LIST OF RESPONDENTS

The 96 respondents are listed below, in alphabetical order, sorted by organisation, then surname.

Organisation	Title	1st Name	Surname	Ref. No.	
Ashford Rural Trust	Mr	John	Talbot	1222	F024
Attwood Trust c/o Graham Warren Partnership	Mr	Graham	Warren	2643	F066
Bapchild Parish Council	Mr	Andrew	Hudson	3701	F089
Blueco Ltd c/o Drivers Jonas	Ms	Helen	Sanders	2123	F094
Bobbing Parish Council	Ms	Sue	Crawford	2208	F041
Borough Green & Platt Bypass Support Group	Mr	Rod	Poulter	1671	F006
Boxley Parish Council	Mrs	Pauline	Bowdery	920	F062
Bredgar Parish Council	Mrs	Hazel	Bexon	2560	F086
Church Commissioners for England c/o DTZ Debenham Tie Leung	Ms	Charlotte	Grant	1205	F093
CPRE (Maidstone District)	Ms	Felicity	Simpson	2246	F040
CPRE Kent	Dr	Hilary	Newport	212	F082
Faversham Town Council	Mrs	Susan	Brockman	2142	F026
Favoured Locations Ltd	Mr	Angus	Bearn	1892	F003
H + H Celcon Ltd c/o Barton Willmore	Mr	Alasdair	Mackenzie	2217	F051
Hartlip Parish Council	Mr	G F	Addicot	2445	F095
High Halden Parish Council	Mr	John	Ball	3681	F027
Holdfast Consortium c/o Michael Parkes	Mr	Michael	Parkes	1293	F074
Iwade Parish Council	Mr	Peter	Wilks	3702	F091
Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce	Mr	Peter	Hawkes	3686	F043
Kent Wildlife Trust	Mr	Richard	Moyse	214	F047
Kingsnorth Parish Council	Miss	J J	Mills	1120	F038
Kitewood Estates	Mr	Paul	Watkins	1093	F001
Medway Countryside Forum	Mr	David	Murr	1076	F056
Medway Magna c/o Graham Warren Partnership	Mr	Graham	Warren	2644	F067
Newington Parish Council	Mr	Paul	Huxtable	2593	F054
Redrow Homes/Taylor Woodrow/David Wilson Homes c/o Boyer Planning Ltd	Mr	David	Lander	3699	F084
River Tram Transit Initiatives Ltd	Mr	Gordon	Winbourne	1169	F083
Rodmersham Parish Council	Mrs	L A	Jordan	2471	F044
Southfleet Parish Council	Mrs	J A	Hardinges	1221	F020
Swale Borough Council	Mr	Brian	Lloyd	118	F088
Thames Water Property Services	Ms	Georgie	Cook	992	F050
The Broadstairs Society	Mr	Jack	Tullett	1228	F037
Trenport Investments Limited c/o Vincent & Gorbing	Mr	R	Lewis	619	F073
Ward Homes Ltd c/o David Lock Associates	Mr	Phil	Copsey	692	F075
West Kingsdown Parish Council	Mrs	P A	Bosley	1008	F057
	Mr	Derek	Abbott	2481	F064
	Mr	B H	Allen	3687	F045
	Mr	Chris	Almond	1359	F022
	Mr	Leslie	Alton	1158	F017
	Mr	& Mrs	Atkins	2288	F029
	Mrs	Anne	Ayres	3693	F068
	Mr	J D I	Baker	1110	F076
	Mrs	D H E	Bispham	2446	F039
	Ms	Monique	Bonney	3700	F087
		J A	Bradbury	975	F081
	Dr	Derek	Brighton	1079	F011
		A H T	Chalaye	1624	F012
	Ms	Angela	Chivers	2572	F060
	Mr	M	Chivers	3692	F065

Organisation	Title	1st Name	Surname	Ref. No.	
	Mr	& Mrs	Corbett	2865	F010
	Dr	Raj	Das	2516	F058
	Mrs	Valerie	Das	2517	F059
	Ms	D	Doorey	3690	F061
	Mr	& Mrs	Easton	3459	F030
	Mr	D	Firbank	1362	F019
	Mr	David	Frost	1658	F009
	Cllr	Tony	Harwood	2103	F015
	Mr	Edward	Hoyal	2348	F018
	Mr	David	Isaac	2526	F052
	Mrs	Mary	Isaac	2527	F053
		A	Jensen	3684	F035
	Mr	Rex	Johnson	1619	F028
	Mr	Charles	Jones	3691	F063
	Ms	Jeannette	Lowden	3015	F036
	Mr	L R	Marchant	3685	F042
	Mr	Allen	Mayhew	3625	F005
	Cllr	Mrs Hazel	McCabe	1246	F025
	Mrs	S	Monday	3695	F077
	Mr	John	Murphy	2439	F070
	Mrs	Kay	Murphy	2438	F069
	Ms	Sue	Murray	1879	F023
	Dr	F H	Panton	3698	F080
		A.P	Prescott	3500	F004
	Mr	& Mrs	Pryde	3363	F008
		D	Quinn	3322	F002
	Mr	& Mrs	Radcliffe	2566	F072
	Mr	& Mrs W A	Ransome	3477	F085
	Mrs	Hilary	Reynolds	3694	F071
	Drs	JI & SM	Richards	3683	F033
	Miss	S J	Russell	857	F007
	Ms	Rochelle	Saunders	3208	F032
	Mr &	Mrs Norman	Shaw	1103	F016
	Mr	Roger	Sills	3688	F049
	Mrs	Susan	Sills	2597	F048
	Mr	Alan	Smith	3229	F021
	Mrs	M E	Smith	2598	F096
	Mrs	E I	Spong	1586	F013
		B D	Steer	2461	F034
		M H	Stranks	3512	F014
	Mr	& Mrs	Teale	3418	F046
	Mrs	M E	Trott	3697	F079
	Mr	T	Trott	3696	F078
	Mr	N S	Vigeon	3682	F031
	Ms	Ann	Welch	3703	F092
	Mrs	June	Wilkins	3689	F055
	Mr	Peter	Wilks	2492	F090

KENT AND MEDWAY STRUCTURE PLAN: ADOPTION DRAFT: POLICY RE-NUMBERING

ADOPTED PLAN POLICY NO.	DEPOSIT PLAN POLICY NO.
CHAPTER 1 – OUR VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES	**CHAPTER 1 – OUR VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES**
SP1 Conserving and Enhancing Kent's Environment	SP1 Conserving and Enhancing Kent's Environment…
CHAPTER 2 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR KENT	**CHAPTER 2 – THE SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR KENT AND MEDWAY**
SS1 Spatial Priorities for Development and Investment in Kent and the role of the settlement hierarchy	SS1 Spatial Priorities for Development and Investment in Kent
-	SS2 Role of Major Urban Areas, other Principal Urban Areas and Rural Service Centres ***Modified and combined with SS1***
SS2 Extent of Metropolitan Green Belt in Kent	SS8 Extent of Metropolitan Green Belt in Kent
SS3 Strategic Gaps	SS10 Strategic Gaps
SS4 Priority for Previously Developed Land & A Sequential Approach to the Location of Development	SS3 Priority for Previously Developed Land & a Sequential Approach to the Location of Development
SS5 Mixed Use in Town Centres & Inner Urban Areas	SS4 Mixed Use in Town Centres & Inner Urban Areas
SS6 Enhancing Existing Communities	SS5 Enhancing Existing Communities
SS7 Development at rural service centres and other rural settlements	SS6 Development at Rural Service Centres and Other Rural Settlements
SS8 Development in the Countryside	SS7 Development in the Countryside
-	SS9 Uses Appropriate within the Green Belt ***Deleted.***
Table SS1 Major and Principal Urban Areas in Kent	Table SS1 Major and Principal Urban Areas in Kent
Table SS2 Rural Service Centres	Table SS2 Rural Service Centres
CHAPTER 3 – AREA POLICIES	**CHAPTER 2 – KENT AND MEDWAY :AREA BASED POLICIES**
DG1 Dartford and Gravesham	NK1 Dartford and Gravesham
ME1 Medway	NK2 Medway
SW1 Swale	NK3 Swale
CA1 Canterbury	EK1 Canterbury
DO1 Dover	EK2 Dover
TH1 Thanet	EK3 Thanet

ADOPTED PLAN POLICY NO.	DEPOSIT PLAN POLICY NO.
AS1 Ashford	CC1 Ashford
MA1 Maidstone	CC2 Maidstone
SH1 Shepway	CC3 Shepway
WK1 West Kent	WK1 West Kent
SE1 Sevenoaks	WK2 Sevenoaks
TM1 Tonbridge and Malling	WK3 Tonbridge and Malling
TW1 Tunbridge Wells	WK4 Tunbridge Wells
CHAPTER 4 – PROTECTING AND ENHANCING OUR NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	**CHAPTER 4 – PROTECTING OUR NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**
EN1 Protecting Kent's Countryside	E1 Protecting Kent's Countryside
EN2 Protecting Kent's Coast and Estuaries	E2 Protecting Kent's Coast and Estuaries
EN3 Protection and Enhancement of Countryside Character	E3 Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character
EN4 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast	E4 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast
EN5 Special Landscape Areas	E5 Special Landscape Areas
EN6 International and National Wildlife Designations	E6 International and National Wildlife Designations
EN7 County and Local Wildlife Designations	E7 County and Local Wildlife Designations
EN8 Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity	E8 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity
EN9 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows	E9 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
EN10 Potential for Community Forests and Woodlands	E10 Potential for Community Forests and Woodlands
EN11 Planning and Management of the Urban Fringe	E11 Planning and Management of the Urban Fringe
EN12 River Corridors	E12 River Corridors
EN13 Environmental Enhancement of Primary Routes	E13 Enhancement of Primary Routes
EN14 Rural Lanes	E14 Rural Lanes
CHAPTER 5 – PROMOTING QUALITY OF LIFE IN TOWN AND COUNTRY	**CHAPTER 5 – PROMOTING QUALITY OF LIFE IN TOWN AND COUNTRY**
QL1 Quality of Development and Design	QL1 Quality of Development and Design
QL2 Priorities for the Public Realm	QL2 Priorities for the Public Realm
QL3 Movement and Accessibility in the Public Realm	QL3 Movement and Accessibility in the Public Realm
QL4 Maintaining the Separation and Identity of Settlements	QL4 Maintaining the Identity of Settlements
-	QL5 Quality and the Density of Development ***Moved partly to Chapter 7 – Housing Provision & DistributionHP3a – and partly to Chapter 6 – Employment & ProsperityFP1***

ADOPTED PLAN POLICY NO.	DEPOSIT PLAN POLICY NO.
QL5 Mix of Uses on Sites	QL6 Mix of Uses on Sites
QL6 Conservation Areas	QL7 Conservation Areas
QL7 Archaeological Sites	QL8 Archaeological Sites
QL8 Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance	QL9 Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance
QL9 Historic Landscape Features	QL10 Historic Landscape Features
QL10 Heritage Assets – Enabling Development	QL11 Heritage Assets – Enabling Development
QL11 The Protection and Enhancement of Existing Community Services	QL12 Existing Community Services and Deficiency
QL12 Provision for New Community Services and Infrastructure	QL13 Provision for New Community Services and Infrastructure
QL13 Cultural development and the arts	QL14 Cultural development and the arts
QL14 Provision for major sporting venues	QL15 Provision for major sporting venues
QL15 Formal and informal recreation/sport facilities	QL16 Formal recreation/sport facilities
QL16 Water recreation	QL17 Water recreation
QL17 Green space networks and rights of way	QL18 Green space networks and rights of way
QL18 Strategic Green Space Initiatives	QL19 Potential for Regional Conservation Parks
CHAPTER 6 – EMPLOYMENT AND PROSPERITY	**CHAPTER 6 – FOSTERING PROSPERITY**
EP1 Land, Workforce, Education and Skills	New policy – introduced at Proposed Modifications stage
EP2 Employment land provision	FP1 Employment land provision
EP3 Location of New or Replacement Employment Land	FP2 Location of New or Replacement Employment Land
EP4 Locations of Strategic Importance for Business, Industrial or Distribution Uses	FP3 Locations of Strategic Importance for Business, Industrial or Distribution Uses
EP5 Land for Technology and Knowledge Clusters	FP4 Land for Technology and Knowledge Clusters
EP6 Premises for small firms	FP5 Premises for small firms
EP7 Development of employment uses in rural areas	FP6 Development of employment uses in rural
EP8 Farm diversification	FP7 Farm diversification
EP9 Protection of agricultural land	FP8 Protection of agricultural land
EP10 Sustainable tourism development	FP9 Sustainable tourism development
EP11 Tourism development and regeneration	FP10 Tourism development and regeneration
EP12 Tourist accommodation	FP11 Tourist accommodation
EP13 Major tourism/visitor attractions	FP12 Major tourism/visitor attractions
EP14 Development at the hierarchy of strategic centres	FP13 Development at the network of strategic centres
EP15 Sequential consideration of sites for retail and leisure development	FP14 Sequential consideration of sites for retail and leisure development
EP16 Development for core comparison goods shopping	FP15 Development for core comparison goods shopping
	FP16 Development of bulky comparison goods retailing

ADOPTED PLAN POLICY NO.	DEPOSIT PLAN POLICY NO.
	Deleted
EP17 Development of large food stores	FP17 Development of large food stores
EP18 Urban and Rural Service Centres	FP18 District and Local centres
Table EP4 The Strategic Hierarchy of Retail and Service Centres in Kent	Table FP4 The Strategic Network of Retail Centres in Kent and Medway
CHAPTER 7 – HOUSING PROVISION AND DISTRIBUTION	**CHAPTER 7 – HOUSING PROVISION AND DISTRIBUTION**
HP1 Housing Provision and Distribution 2001-2016	HP1 Housing Provision and Distribution 2001-2021
	HP2 Phased provision of housing land ***Modified and Incorporated into new Policy HP2***
HP2 Housing Provision: Phasing, Assessment and Sequential Approach to Location	
HP3 Contribution of Previously Developed Land and Previously Used Buildings to Housing Provision 2001-2016	HP3 Contribution of Previously Developed Land to Housing Provision 2001-2016
HP4 Housing : Quality and density of development	***Originally Policy QL5 –major part incorporated into Policy HP4***
-	HP4 Sequential approach to Location of New Housing Provision ***Modified and Incorporated in to new policy HP2***
-	HP5 Assessment of New Housing Land ***Modified and incorporated into new policy HP2***
HP5 Housing Development in the Countryside	HP6 Housing Development in the Countryside
HP6 Range and Mix of Housing Provision	HP7 Range and Mix of Housing Provision
HP7 Affordable Housing Provision	HP8 Affordable Housing Provision
HP8 Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites	HP9 Affordable Housing on Rural exception Sites
HP9 Provision of Permanent and Transit Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation	HP10 Provision of Permanent and Transit Gypsy Accommodation
CHAPTER 8 – PROMOTING QUALITY, CHOICE AND ACCESSIBILITY IN THE TRANSPORT NETWORK	**CHAPTER 8 – PROMOTING QUALITY, CHOICE AND ACCESSIBILITY IN THE TRANSPORT NETWORK**
TP1 Integrated Transport Strategy	New policy introduced in Proposed Modifications
TP2 Assessment Criteria for Transport Proposals	TP1 Assessment Criteria for Transport Proposals
TP3 Transport and the Location of Development	TP2 Transport and the Location of Development
TP4 Safeguarding of Programmed Strategic Transport Schemes	TP3 Safeguarding of Programmed Strategic Transport Schemes
TP5 Support for Strategic Rail Schemes	TP4 Support for Strategic Rail Schemes
TP6 Major Transport Corridors	TP5 Major Transport Corridors
TP7Further Thames Crossing	TP6 Further Thames Crossing
TP8 Future Strategic Transport Schemes	TP7 Future Strategic Transport Schemes
TP9 Supporting Public Transport	TP8 Supporting Public Transport

ADOPTED PLAN POLICY NO.	DEPOSIT PLAN POLICY NO.
TP10 Supporting Park and Ride	TP9 Supporting Park and Ride
TP11 Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists	TP10 Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists
TP12 Development and Access to the Primary/Secondary Road Network	TP11 Development and Access to the Primary/Secondary Road Network
TP13 Rail Freight and Handling Facilities	TP12 Rail Freight and Handling Facilities
TP14 Safeguarding of Railway Land for Transport Purposes	TP13 Safeguarding of Railway Land for Transport Purposes
TP15 Development Traffic and Heavy Goods Vehicles	TP14 Development Traffic and Heavy Goods Vehicles
TP16 Local Transport Strategies	TP15 Local Transport Strategies
TP17 Traffic and Management of Minor Roads	TP16 Traffic and Minor Roads
	TP17 Management of Minor Roads ***Included within new TP17***
TP18 Roadside Services	TP18 Roadside Services
TP19 Vehicle Parking Standards	TP19 Vehicle Parking Standards
TP20 Gateway Function of the Ports	TP20 Gateway Function of the Ports
TP21 Channel Tunnel Capacity and Second Fixed Link	TP21 Channel Tunnel Capacity and Second Fixed Link
TP22 Kent Ports	TP22 Kent and Medway Ports
TP23 Major Distribution and Transhipment Centres	TP23 Major Distribution and Transhipment Centres
TP24 Kent International (Manston) Airport	TP24 Manston Airport
TP25 Lydd Airport	TP25 Lydd Airport
TP26 Other Airports and Airfields	TP26 Other Airports and Airfields
CHAPTER 9 MANAGING OUR NATURAL RESOURCES : Climate change- Energy Production- Water Resources and Flood Risk	**CHAPTER 9 : CLIMATE CHANGE AND MANAGING OUR NATURAL RESOURCES**
NR1Development and the Prudent Use of Resources	New policy introduced at Proposed Modifications stage
NR2 Energy Generation	NR1 Energy Generation
NR3 Renewable and Sustainable Energy Production	NR2 Renewable Energy Production
NR4 Combined Heat and Power Generation	NR3 Combined Heat and Power Generation
NR5 Pollution Impacts	NR4 Pollution Impacts
NR6 Development Sensitive to Pollution	NR5 Development Sensitive to Pollution
NR7 Air Quality Management Areas	NR6 Air Quality Management Areas
NR8 Water Quality	NR7 Water Quality
NR9 Water Supply and Wastewater treatment	NR8 Water Supply and Wastewater treatment
NR10 Development and Flood Risk	NR9 Development and Flood Risk
NR11 Flood Protection	NR10 Flood Protection

ADOPTED PLAN POLICY NO.	DEPOSIT PLAN POLICY NO.
CHAPTER 10 MANAGING OUR WASTE AND MINERAL RESOURCES	**CHAPTER 10 MANAGING OUR WASTE AND MINERAL RESOURCES**
WM1 Integrated Waste Management	WM1 Integrated Waste Management
WM2 Assessment Criteria for Waste Proposals	WM2 Assessment criteria for waste proposals
WM3 Securing Waste Reduction	WM3 Securing waste reduction
WM4 Planning for Waste Management Capacity	WM4 Planning for waste management capacity
WM5 Waste Disposal to Land	WM5 Waste Disposal to Land
WM6 Assessment of Strategic Waste Management Facilities	WM6 Assessment of Strategic Waste Management Facilities
WM7 Construction Related Spoil	WM7 Construction Related Spoil
MN1 Sources of Mineral Supply	M1 Sources of Mineral Supply
MN2 Use of Secondary/Recycled Materials	M2 Use of Secondary/Recycled Materials
MN3 Assessment Criteria for Minerals Proposals	M3 Assessment Criteria for Minerals Proposals
MN4 Provision and safeguarding of Marine Wharves and Rail Depots	M4 Provision and Safeguarding of Marine Wharves and Rail Depots
MN5 Provision for Construction Aggregates	M5 Provision for Construction Aggregates
MN6 Limestone Extraction in East Kent	M6 Limestone Extraction in East Kent
MN7 Silica Sand	M7 Silica Sand
MN8 Building Stone	M8 Building Stone
MN9 Brickearth	M9 Brickearth
MN10 Chalk and Clay	M10 Chalk and Clay
MN11 Oil, Gas and Coalbed Methane	M11 Oil, Gas and Coalbed Methane
MN12 Safeguarding of Strategically Important Minerals	M12 Safeguarding of Strategically Important Minerals
CHAPTER 11 IMPLEMENTING THE STRUCTURE PLAN AND MONITORING ITS EFFECTIVENESS	**CHAPTER 11 IMPLEMENTING THE STRUCTURE PLAN AND MONITORING ITS EFFECTIVENESS**
IM1 Meeting the costs of community and other infrastructure needs generated by new development	IMP1 Meeting the costs of community and other infrastructure generated by new development

County Council May 25th 2006: Item : Annex 3

KENT AND MEDWAY STRUCTURE PLAN 2006

Adopted Plan Policies

Contents

Chapter

1	Our Vision and Guiding Principles
2	The Spatial Strategy for Kent
3	Area Policies
4	Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural Environment
5	Promoting Quality of Life in Town and Country
6	Employment and Prosperity
7	Housing Provision and Distribution
8	Promoting Quality, Choice and Accessibility in our Transport Network
9	Managing Our Natural Resources; *Climate Change – Energy Production- Water Resources – Flood Risk*
10	Managing Our Waste and Mineral Resources
11	Implementing the Structure Plan and Monitoring its Effectiveness
Appendix 1	Glossary and Abbreviations (to be inserted)
Appendix 2	Reference Documents (to be inserted)

Key Diagram

Chapter 1: Our Vision and Guiding Principles

Policy SP1: Conserving and Enhancing Kent's Environment and Ensuring a Sustainable Pattern of Development

The primary purpose of Kent's development and environmental strategy will be to protect and enhance the environment and achieve a sustainable pattern and form of development. This will be done principally by:

- **protecting the Kent countryside and its wildlife for future generations;**
- **reducing reliance on greenfield sites to accommodate all forms of built development;**
- **using and re-using land and buildings for development more efficiently;**
- **protecting and enhancing features of importance in the natural and built environment;**
- **reducing the need to travel, encouraging the availability of a choice of transport, reducing growth in dependence on the road network and fostering good accessibility to jobs and services for all sections of the community;**
- **encouraging high quality development and innovative design that reflects Kent's identity and local distinctiveness and promoting healthy, safe and secure living and working environments;**
- **fostering balanced and timely provision of housing, employment, infrastructure and community services to meet the social needs of the community and to help maintain and develop well functioning settlements;**
- **supporting the retention and growth of Kent's employment and investment in a manner that contributes to a sustainable pattern of development;**
- **fostering a prosperous rural economy which respects the character of the countryside and rural settlements;**
- **responding to the implications of long term climate change by:**
  - **advancing the conservation and prudent use of energy, water and other natural resources;**
  - **minimising pollution and assisting the control of greenhouse gas emissions;**
  - **safeguarding areas of potential flood risk from development.**

Chapter 2: The Spatial Strategy for Kent

Policy SS1: Spatial Priorities for Development and Investment in Kent and the role of the settlement hierarchy

The main priorities for development and investment in Kent, particularly public funding, will be focused upon:

(i) The regional growth areas:
- **Kent Thames Gateway within North Kent;**
- **At Ashford; and**

(ii) In East Kent at the coastal towns in the Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration

In these and the other areas of Kent:

(a) the scale, nature and timing of development will be determined as appropriate by:
- **improvements in transport and accessibility (Chapter 8);**
- **investment in other essential infrastructure;**
- **the area based policies of this Plan (Chapter 3);**
- **the district based policy quantities for employment land and housing (EP2 and HP1 respectively);**

(b) the majority of new development will be concentrated at the Major Urban Areas, as shown on the Key Diagram:
- **in Kent Thames Gateway at Kent Thameside (within Dartford and Gravesham Boroughs) and the Medway Towns;**
- **at the Thanet Towns;**
- **at Ashford as a regional growth point;**
- **at Maidstone and the urban areas of the Medway Gap and Kings Hill.**

(c) In Districts with no Major Urban Areas, provision for development will be concentrated at the Principal Urban Areas as shown on the Key Diagram.

(d) Development at rural settlements should be concentrated at the Rural Service Centres identified on the Key Diagram. Proposals for development at other rural settlements, identified in Local Development Documents, should demonstrate that such development would be sustainable.

The strategic development requirements of this Plan should be met in a manner that provides for balanced and timely residential, employment, retail and leisure development, and brings forward community facilities and infrastructure when they are needed, while at the same time conserving and enhancing the quality of Kent's environment.

Table SS1: Major and Principal Urban Areas in Kent

DISTRICT	MAJOR URBAN AREAS	OTHER PRINCIPAL URBAN AREAS
Ashford	Ashford	
Canterbury		Canterbury Herne Bay and Whitstable
Dartford/Gravesham	Kent Thameside (Dartford/Stone/Greenhithe/	

	Swanscombe) (Gravesend/ Northfleet)	
Dover		Dover Deal
Maidstone/ Tonbridge and Malling	Maidstone/Medway Gap* and Kings Hill	Tonbridge
Sevenoaks		Sevenoaks Swanley
Shepway		Folkestone/Hythe
Swale		Sittingbourne Sheerness / Queenborough / Minster/ Halfway Faversham
Thanet	Thanet Towns (Margate/Ramsgate, Broadstairs, Birchington, Westgate)	
Tunbridge Wells		Tunbridge Wells / Southborough
Medway	Medway Towns	

** including Aylesford, Ditton, Larkfield, New Hythe, Snodland and Leybourne*

Table SS2: Rural Service Centres

Borough Green	New Romney
Cranbrook	Paddock Wood
Edenbridge	Sandwich
Hawkhurst	Staplehurst
Headcorn	Tenterden
Hoo St Werburgh	Westerham
Lydd	West Malling

Policy SS2: Extent of the Metropolitan Green Belt in Kent

The Metropolitan Green Belt will extend about 15 miles from the edge of the built up area of Greater London, i.e. to the east of Gravesend, to the west of Rochester and West Malling, and to the east of Wateringbury and Nettlestead. It will also extend to the west of Paddock Wood and east of Tunbridge Wells. The detailed boundaries are established through Local Plans/Local Development Documents.

The boundary of the Green Belt at Dartford on the north side of the A2 is amended to exclude Eastern Quarry and St Clement's Valley from the Green Belt. New boundaries are being defined through the Dartford Local Development Framework.

Within the Green Belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development. New building should accord with the provisions of PPG2 and Annex B of PPG3.

Policy SS3: Strategic Gaps

Strategic Gaps are designated to maintain the separation of:

- **the Maidstone and Medway Gap urban areas from the Medway Towns and from each other;**
- **settlements on the east and west sides of the River Medway;**
- **the Medway Towns and Sittingbourne urban areas, including the separation of Iwade from Sittingbourne and from Ridham and Kemsley.**

Within these gaps any development proposals which would significantly extend settlements beyond their existing built confines or the areas identified for development in this Plan or current local plan allocations, will not be permitted. Detailed boundaries of the strategic gaps will be identified or revised through Local Plans/Local Development Documents.

Policy SS4: Priority for previously developed land and a sequential approach to the location of development

In the preparation of Local Plans or Local Development Documents, development requirements which are not met by sites with existing planning permission should be provided through the consideration of, firstly, previously developed land or previously used buildings and then greenfield land. Assessment of development locations will follow, as appropriate, the sequential consideration of sites set out in Policies HP2, EP3 and EP15 of this Plan.

Policy SS5: Mixed use in town centres and inner urban areas

Development which assists Kent's town centres to be prosperous, safe, vibrant and with high standards of design and maintenance will be supported.

Within the core of town centres first priority should attach to retail, service and leisure uses. Office, community, cultural and residential uses should also be provided, where practicable, as part of mixed use developments.

Elsewhere within town centres and edge of town centre locations a diversity of land uses will be encouraged including residential development providing for a mix of dwelling type and size.

Alternative locations should be identified for the relocation of non-conforming uses which cause serious environmental disruption for residential use.

Policy SS6: Enhancing existing communities

Measures will be taken to improve the built and natural environment, functioning and appearance of the suburbs of the major/principal urban areas. This will include landscaping, traffic management, improvements to connectivity to, and within, these areas and the provision of services and facilities that serve local needs.

Policy SS7: Development at Rural Service Centres and other rural settlements

(a) Rural Service Centres, as identified on the Key Diagram, will be the focus for community services, improved public transport and small scale housing and employment serving the area.

(b) Smaller rural settlements may be identified in Local Development Documents as suitable for small scale development if they meet the following criteria:

- **good road and public transport access and connectivity; and**
- **an existing core of employment and community services.**

(c) For larger rural settlements which lack services, a rural services standards assessment should be undertaken. The need for, and provision for service improvements should be identified in community strategies and Local Development Documents.

Other than at Strategic Development Locations identified by this Plan, development at, but outside the built confines of rural settlements, should be small scale and:

- **identified in a Local Development Document; or**
- **be supported by a special local justification which may include the provision of affordable housing, community facilities or the expansion of an established business.**

<u>Policy SS8: Development in the countryside</u>

Housing development in the countryside will be subject to Policy HP5.

Non residential development in rural Kent other than at rural settlements should:

(i) be demonstrated to be necessary to agriculture, forestry, the winning of minerals or other land uses for which a rural location is essential; or

(ii) be the re-use, adaptation or redevelopment of an existing rural building or institution, where the change is acceptable on environmental, traffic and other planning grounds; or

(iii) provide a public facility for which a rural location is justified; or

(iv) allow for business development in accordance with Policy EP7(ii) or the business diversification of an existing farm in accordance with Policy EP8.

Chapter 3: Area Policies

Policy DG1: Dartford and Gravesham

At, and between, the principal urban areas of Dartford and Gravesend/ Northfleet major mixed use developments based on previously developed or other damaged land will be comprehensively planned, including appropriate measures to integrate new development with existing communities, and phased in conjunction with the provision of new highway and public transport infrastructure, community services and facilities, air quality management initiatives, flood defences, and water resources and wastewater treatment infrastructure.

Provision will be made for a high quality bus-based public transport network (*Fastrack)* linking Dartford and Gravesend town centres, Bluewater and the main Strategic Development Locations identified by this Plan.

Opportunities for enhancing the economic, leisure, amenity and transport potential of the River Thames will be identified, including safeguarding of deep-water facilities and associated land at Northfleet Riverside.

As part of a comprehensive greenspace strategy, provision will be made for a network of open land and green spaces ('Green Grid') which will link major areas of open space with the Thames and with existing and new communities.

Proposals for the main Strategic Development Locations should contribute to enhancing the quality of the built, open and natural environment, including provision of elements of the Green Grid, and support a pattern, form and density of development that reflects accessibility to existing and planned public transport provision.

Strategic Development Locations will include those at:

(a) Ebbsfleet as the location for development of a combined domestic and international passenger station on the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, a new business centre, major residential development and community facilities. Development should reflect a high standard of civic design and landscaping and be integrated with new and improved transport networks including *Fastrack* and Crossrail;
(b) Eastern Quarry for a series of linked and integrated communities with an emphasis on housing provision, together with social and community facilities and business development to be developed in accordance with a Master Plan and integrated with a new and improved public transport network (*Fastrack*);
(c) North Dartford, to the west of the A282 for business, housing, leisure and recreation uses;
(d) Crossways Business Park, to the east of the A282, for continued mixed commercial development involving office, industrial and distribution uses;
(e) Swanscombe Peninsula (East and West) for a new mixed use community, predominantly for housing, taking full account of the area's relationship with the River Thames, the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, other physical constraints to development including ground conditions and flood risk and integrated with a new and improved public transport network;
(f) Gravesend/Northfleet Riverside and North East Gravesend involving the reuse of previously used land and premises and in the case of North East Gravesend, provision of the Denton Relief Road.

Policy ME1: Medway

Proposals to regenerate Medway should focus upon the Medway Waterfront including central Chatham, Rochester Riverside and at Strood.

Expansion beyond the Medway urban area to meet development requirements should be concentrated at a new, mixed-use community at Chattenden/Lodge Hill on previously developed land or such alternative land as may be identified in Local Development Documents in the event that the former defence land fails to come forward when necessary to provide for the planned employment or housing provision for Medway.

Development for the Higher and Further Education sectors including a full-scale university campus, will be supported. Provision will be made for the technology and knowledge sectors adjacent to Rochester Airfield, at Chatham Maritime and Chattenden/Lodge Hill.

Completion of improvements to the A228 together with rail access improvements to support growth of Thamesport and industrial and commercial development at Grain and Kingsnorth will be promoted.

Major new town centre investment at Chatham on a scale appropriate to one of the region's principal urban centres will be supported, particularly in relation to new public transport capacity, employment provision, retail, cultural, tourism and leisure facilities.

As part of a comprehensive greenspaces strategy, provision will be made for a network of open land (Green Grid) which will link major areas of open space with the Thames and Medway and with existing and new communities.

Policy SW1: Swale

Within the Thames Gateway part of Swale measures to support economic regeneration and diversification at Sittingbourne and Sheerness/ Queenborough will be pursued. Provision of the A249 Second Swale Crossing and the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road (linking the A249 with the A2 to the east) are prime requirements for this. Other Strategic Development Locations include:

(a) opportunities for mixed business, industrial and distribution and residential development already identified at Ridham/Kemsley;
(b) expansion of the port of Sheerness in accordance with Policy TP22;
(c) completion of the strategic expansion of Iwade for c.1200 dwellings (including the initial phase previously allocated through the Swale Borough Local Plan). Provision for development should ensure no infringement upon areas of wildlife importance or on high quality agricultural land and maintain separation between Iwade and Sittingbourne;
(d) mixed-use urban expansion at North East Sittingbourne (including land currently allocated through the Swale Borough Local Plan) in conjunction with the definition and phased provision of the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road from its link with the A249. Provision for development should avoid infringement upon areas of wildlife importance and minimise the call upon high quality agricultural land;
(e) mixed use regeneration involving development around Milton Creek, Sittingbourne for housing, business, retail and leisure development, community facilities and environmental enhancement, and providing good links with the town centre. Development should be phased in conjunction with the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road;
(f) regeneration involving mixed use development at Queenborough and Rushenden on the Isle of Sheppey for housing, employment, and community facilities in conjunction with environmental improvements and transport measures including the Rushenden Link Road to the A249;

(g) expansion of Kent Science Park as an innovation hub and technology and knowledge based cluster subject to the provision of improved access arrangements.

At Faversham conservation of the historic environment remains the prime consideration.

Peripheral growth of Faversham for residential development is not envisaged. Improvement of local employment opportunities will be pursued but should incorporate a review of the scale and location of previous commitments which remain unimplemented with a view to rationalisation, consideration of alternative site provision and husbanding of land in established employment uses.

Within this framework full and effective use should be made of development capacity within the town providing for a balance of business, commercial and residential development with particular attention paid to meeting locally based needs for housing.

Policy AS1: Ashford

Ashford is identified as a regional centre for growth. This was confirmed in RPG9 (2004).

The location and phasing of development will be comprehensively planned. Expansion will be focused on high quality and sustainable developments in and around central Ashford and, where further greenfield development is required, within a broad area of search to the south of the town between the M20 and A28 progressing from the south east and south towards the west.

Early measures to improve the public realm and quality of life in Ashford should include major investment in educational, cultural, retail, leisure, convention and community facilities.

Provision will be made for additional land for business development to meet requirements beyond 2011 for balanced employment and housing growth.

Major investment in physical infrastructure, social and community facilities, public transport enhancement, other sustainable transport initiatives and environmental management will be required to support the growth in residential and business development proposed and the existing community. This will include:

- **Enhanced junction capacity on the M20 involving improvements to Junction 10, a new Junction 10a and, in the longer term, improvements at Junction 9;**
- **Quality bus corridors, Park and Ride facilities and a consolidated bus hub in central Ashford**
- **Measures to manage flood risk in the Stour Valley including surface water drainage improvements;**
- **Provision for sustainable management of water resources, including facilities for increasing water supply and the treatment of wastewater in conjunction with the maintenance of water quality standards;**
- **An enhanced network of water and public greenspaces;**
- **Positive management of the urban fringe around Ashford for recreation and the enhancement of biodiversity.**

An assessment will be undertaken to examine the potential role of new transport links between the A2070 and the A28 to the south west of the town.

Following masterplanning of Ashford's growth, Local Development Documents should identify the outer limit of Ashford's planned expansion and measures to:

(a) protect the open countryside in the M20/A20 corridor towards Folkestone, taking account of the requirement for a new motorway junction on the M20 to the south east of Ashford (Junction 10a); and
(b) maintain the separate identity of rural settlements around an enlarged Ashford urban area.

In the rest of Ashford Borough the principal planning policy will be to protect and enhance the character of the countryside and the rural setting of its towns and villages.

Policy CA1: Canterbury

At Canterbury the location of new development will be governed by the need to conserve the built environment and setting of the historic city.

Expansion of the Further and Higher Education sectors in Canterbury will be supported. Knowledge and technology uses linked to this sector will be encouraged, initially through the identification of a site not exceeding 10 hectares.

Proposals for major cultural facilities and high quality tourism accommodation in, or with good access to, the city centre will be encouraged.

New office accommodation contributing to local business need, diversification of the economy and urban regeneration will be promoted in the city and through provision for up to 20 hectares (or its floorspace equivalent of 70,000 square metres) for business development (Use Classes B1 (a) and B1 (b)) at Canterbury at a location easily accessible to the city by way of public transport and cycling as well as by car.

The supply of housing land will primarily rely on enhanced urban capacity, unless alternative land identified in Local Development Documents is justified to provide for the housing requirement within this Plan.

The transport strategy for the City of Canterbury will be reviewed to:
(a) bring forward further initiatives to provide for enhanced public transport and facilities for cycling and walking as alternatives to the use of the car;
(b) promote junction improvements on the A2 to the west and south of Canterbury.

At Herne Bay/Whitstable it is strategic policy to enhance and diversify the local economy. A site, or sites at Herne Bay/Whitstable, providing up to 10 hectares (or its floorspace equivalent of 35,000 square metres) for the relocation and expansion of local firms and inward investment, should be identified.

At Hersden proposals to assist regeneration will be supported consistent with its location within a Priority Area for Economic Regeneration, as designated by RPG9, and commensurate with its size, location and status as a rural settlement.

Policy SH1: Shepway

Proposals which assist in regenerating Folkestone, including improvement of its shopping, service and tourism functions will be supported. Provision for mixed-use regeneration of the harbour and seafront should incorporate a major residential element and consider opportunities for alternative uses of the port.

The expansion of Hawkinge as a Strategic Development Location should be completed on the basis identified in the Shepway Local Plan with no further major development on the

Downs. Provision for up to 20 hectares of additional land (or its floorspace equivalent of 70,000 square metres) for business development should be identified and be well related to the Folkestone/Hythe urban area or New Romney/Lydd.

Proposals to strengthen the rural economy of Romney Marsh should be concentrated at New Romney and Lydd. Proposals to retain and strengthen the current uses at Lydd Airport and Folkestone Racecourse and to bring forward employment land at Link Park Lympne should be pursued.

Policy DO1: Dover

Development in Dover should strengthen and diversify its economy and promote environmental enhancement. This will include support for pharmaceuticals research and development in the Sandwich Corridor at Richborough and implementation of strategic employment land at Dover (White Cliffs Business Park). Appropriate expansion and diversification of the Port of Dover and mixed use redevelopment of the Dover Town Investment Zone will also be supported.

The economic prosperity of Deal and Sandwich will continue to be supported as will their role as service centres for the East Kent coast.

Proposals supporting the regeneration of the former East Kent Coalfield sites primarily involving the provision of new employment and recreational uses should be continued.

The mixed-use expansion of Aylesham, incorporating provision for up to 1,000 dwellings by 2016, is supported.

The housing provision for Dover District (Policy HP1) includes:
(a) a minimum of 300 dwellings for the post 2006 period to be accommodated at a location, or locations, that can support, and offer good accessibility to, business growth to the north of Sandwich;
(b) 900 dwellings for the post 2011 period at Dover and/or Deal on sites to be identified through Local Development Documents.

Improvements to transport infrastructure and accessibility should include early implementation of the East Kent Access proposals in the A256 corridor, A2 improvements between Lydden and Dover, rail access to the port of Dover, and rail infrastructure and service improvements between Dover and Canterbury, Thanet, and Ashford.

Policy TH1: Thanet

Development in Thanet must address the long standing economic and social problems of the area by strengthening and diversifying the local economy and employment base.

Proposals for growth in Thanet should provide a better balance between housing and employment by enhancing the rate of inward investment in the economy. As a key catalyst for economic growth the expansion of Manston Airport for passengers and freight will be supported including the development of new terminal and freight handling facilities.

Developments which will contribute to the regeneration of the central and seafront areas of Ramsgate and Margate, including cultural and tourism-related proposals, will be supported. This includes initiatives for Ramsgate Waterfront and Margate Old Town.

A new town centre for Thanet at Westwood will involve mixed use retail, service and leisure uses and a new public transport interchange, and be developed predominantly on previously used land.

A Strategic Development Location of up to 1,000 dwellings for the post 2006 period, adjoining the urban area at Westwood, should be defined and phased through the Local Plan/Local Development Framework.

Improvements to infrastructure will be required to support economic growth and improve accessibility, including East Kent Access (within the A256 and A253 corridors), rail infrastructure and service improvements between Thanet and Canterbury, Dover, Ashford and London and an eventual direct rail link to Manston Airport.

Policy WK1: West Kent

In the West Kent Districts of Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells and Tonbridge and Malling:

(a) there will be no release of land from the Metropolitan Green Belt to meet strategic requirements and no major release of additional greenfield land beyond land committed at 2001 for residential or business development;

(b) in seeking to make the best use of land within the principal urban areas for housing the local planning authorities should make provision to safeguard existing and/or new employment land for more intensive (office) employment uses at locations in, or close to, the town centres of the principal urban areas.

Policy MA1: Maidstone

Proposals for new office and residential uses should focus on the centre of Maidstone to provide close integration between employment, housing and public transport facilities.

Proposals to enhance and broaden the town centre's retail, leisure, tourism and cultural draw will be supported. Transport improvements to support these initiatives will include the A229 Upper Stone Street improvements and All Saints Link.

No large-scale release of greenfield land for housing will be provided beyond an amount equivalent to that already allocated for housing development in the Maidstone Local Plan.

Provision of land for economic development at Maidstone should be re-appraised to ensure that sufficient land and floorspace is available to comply with Policy EP1(c). This re-appraisal should not:
(i) undermine the principal role of the Strategic Gap in separating north Maidstone, as defined by the M20, from the Medway Towns urban area and the north western edge of Maidstone from Aylesford/Ditton;
(ii) prejudice the role of the North Downs Special Landscape Area in protecting the foreground of the North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Policy TM1: Tonbridge and Malling

Within Tonbridge & Malling Borough, housing and employment growth will be concentrated at the following strategic development locations:

- **Kings Hill for continued development of a new mixed-use urban community involving phased development of a campus style business park, major residential development and associated social and community facilities. A revised mix of land use to reduce B1**

employment provision and increase the housing element will be pursued;

- **Holborough Quarry, to the north of Snodland and west of the A228, principally for housing and associated social and community facilities;**

- **Leybourne Grange, to the south of the M20 and west of the A228, for housing development and associated social and community facilities;**

- **Peters Pit, on the East Bank of the Medway, principally for housing and associated social and community facilities and subject to the provision of transport infrastructure including a new crossing of the Medway.**

Policy SE1: Sevenoaks

Within Sevenoaks District the scale of new housing development reflects its location wholly within the inner Metropolitan Green Belt, the relatively small scale of the principal urban areas of Sevenoaks and Swanley and the character of their built environments.

Fort Halstead is identified as a prospective business cluster associated with its established role in research. Proposals to expand technology and knowledge activities will be supported subject to the provisions of policy EP5.

Policy TW1: Tunbridge Wells

The prime consideration at the urban area of Tunbridge Wells in the quantity and location of development will be the conservation of the built and natural environment, the setting of the town and its location within the Green Belt.

Within this framework full and effective use of development capacity within the principal urban area of Tunbridge Wells/Southborough will be pursued. This should provide for a balance of business, commercial and residential development with particular attention paid to meeting locally based needs for housing.

Chapter 4 : Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural Environment

Policy EN1: Protecting Kent's Countryside

Kent's countryside will be protected, conserved and enhanced for its own sake. This is important for the social, economic and environmental well being of Kent. Development in the countryside should seek to maintain or enhance it. Development which will adversely affect the countryside will not be permitted unless there is an overriding need for it which outweighs the requirement to protect the countryside. Development so permitted should include appropriate mitigation and/or compensation.

Policy EN2: Protecting Kent's Coast and Estuaries

Kent's undeveloped coast and estuaries will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Development in such areas and in adjoining countryside will not be permitted if it materially detracts from the scenic, heritage, wildlife or scientific value of these areas. Development so permitted should include appropriate mitigation and/or compensation.

Policy EN3: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside Character

Kent's landscape and wildlife habitats will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Development will not be permitted if it would lead to the loss of features or habitats which are of landscape, historic, wildlife or geological importance, or are of an unspoilt quality free from urban intrusion unless there is a need for development which outweighs these considerations.

Where a need for development in the countryside is justified, important features and characteristics will be retained. Proposals should reflect the need for conservation, reinforcement, restoration or creation of countryside character and provide for the appropriate management of important features and the wider landscape.

Where formal assessments of landscape character and quality identify landscapes of local significance, they should be designated in Local Development Documents.

Policy EN4: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Heritage Coast

Protection will be given to the nationally important landscapes of:

- **the Kent Downs and High Weald Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and**
- **Kent's Heritage Coast between Kingsdown and Dover and between Dover and Folkestone.**

The primary objective in these areas will be to protect, conserve and enhance landscape character and natural beauty.

Major commercial, mineral or transport infrastructure developments will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:

(a) there is a proven national interest;
(b) there are no alternative sites available or the need cannot be met in any other way; and
(c) appropriate provision can be made to minimise harm to the environment.

Other development which would be detrimental to the natural beauty, quality and character of the landscape and quiet enjoyment of the area will not be permitted. Development that is essential to meet local social or economic needs should be permitted provided that it is consistent with the purpose of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast.

Policy EN5: Special Landscape Areas

Special Landscape Areas are defined as follows and indicated on the Key Diagram. Detailed boundaries of the SLAs will be reviewed and defined in Local Plans/Local Development Documents.

North Downs
Greensand Belt
High Weald
Eastern Low Weald
Western Low Weald
Old Romney Shoreline
North Kent Marshes
Sandwich Bay/Pegwell Bay
Dungeness
Blean Woods

The primary objective of designating Special Landscape Areas is the protection, conservation and enhancement of the quality of their landscapes, whilst having regard to the need to facilitate the social and economic well-being of the communities situated within them.

Policy EN6: International and National Wildlife Designations

Development will not be permitted where it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively, materially harm the scientific or nature conservation interests of any of the following categories of sites:

- **a European site;**
- **a proposed European site;**
- **a Ramsar site;**
- **a Site of Special Scientific Interest;**
- **a National Nature Reserve.**

Policy EN7: County and Local Wildlife Designations

Development which would materially harm the scientific or nature conservation interests, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively, of:

- **Local Nature Reserves**
- **County Wildlife Sites identified in Local Development Documents**
- **Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Sites**

will not be permitted unless there is a need which outweighs the local nature conservation or geological/geomorphological interest and adverse impacts can be adequately compensated.

Policy EN8: Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Biodiversity

Wildlife habitats and species will be protected, conserved and enhanced, especially through long term management and habitat creation schemes, particularly where they have been

identified as national and county priorities in the UK and Kent Biodiversity Action Plan(s), or where they are protected under wildlife legislation. This will be secured by:

a) ensuring that site evaluation is undertaken to establish the nature conservation value of proposed development sites;
b) identifying, safeguarding and managing existing and potential land for nature conservation as part of development proposals, particularly where a connected series of sites can be achieved;
c) local planning authorities identifying locations and proposals for habitat and species management, restoration and creation.

Development likely to have an adverse effect, directly, indirectly or cumulatively, on important habitats or species will not be permitted unless:

- **there is an overriding need for the development that outweighs adverse impact on nature conservation; and**
- **adverse impact on an important nature conservation resource can be adequately mitigated and/or compensated.**

Policy EN9: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

Provision should be made for the creation of new woodland, especially indigenous broad-leaved species at appropriate locations in Kent, including provision of new habitats as part of development proposals.

Tree cover and the hedgerow network should be maintained. Additionally, they should be enhanced where this would improve the landscape, biodiversity, or link existing woodland habitats. Ancient and semi-natural woodland will be protected and, where possible, enhanced.

Policy EN10: Potential for Community Forests and Woodlands

The potential for community forests or community woodland sites will be investigated in North Kent and at Ashford and other suitable locations and where appropriate, defined and safeguarded in Local Development Documents.

Policy EN11: Planning and Management of the Urban Fringe

Local Planning Authorities will work together and with others to draw up and implement strategies for ensuring effective environmental management and high quality design for urban fringe areas, particularly in Dartford/Gravesham (Kent Thameside), at Ashford and where other large-scale new developments are proposed.

Local Development Documents will provide policies for such areas that ensure:

- **the maintenance or enhancement of landscape and urban character;**
- **the creation of new habitats;**
- **the safeguarding of land for public access and the provision of recreational networks, including linkage with existing communities/built-up areas;**
- **where appropriate, the enhancement of damaged, despoiled or degraded land.**

Where directly related, contributions from developments to the implementation of such programmes may be required.

Policy EN12: River Corridors

The environment within river corridors and river catchments, including the landscape, water environment and wildlife habitats, will be conserved and enhanced. Where consistent with this, provision will be made for:

- **increased opportunities for access and water recreation;**
- **increased public access for walking, cycling and horse riding and links to existing rights of way and cycleway networks.**

Supply of water, treatment and disposal of waste water and flood risk management should be sustainable and deliver environmental benefits.

Policy EN13: Environmental Enhancement of Primary Routes

Enhancement of landscape quality and character and of wildlife habitats along primary road and rail routes, including important tourist routes, will be promoted.

Policy EN14: Rural Lanes

Rural lanes which are of landscape, amenity, nature conservation, historic or archaeological importance will be protected from changes and management practices which would damage their character, and where possible will be enhanced.

Chapter 5 : Promoting Quality of Life in Town and Country

Policy QL1: Quality of Development and Design

(i) **All development should be well designed and be of high quality. Developments, individually or taken together, should respond positively to the scale, layout, pattern and character of their local surroundings. Development which would be detrimental to the built environment, amenity, functioning and character of settlements or the countryside will not be permitted. Existing built environment of high quality and character will be protected and enhanced. Innovative design will be encouraged where appropriate.**

(ii) **Local authorities and others will:**

- **(a) ensure that the distinctive character of towns and villages is conserved and improved;**
- **(b) apply the principles of the Kent Design Guide when determining planning applications and preparing site-specific development guidance;**
- **(c) require, where appropriate, that a design statement accompanies significant proposals for development with accurate illustrations of the development in its surroundings;**
- **(d) develop design policies for their area based on an analysis of the quality, character and significance of the surrounding built and natural environment. This will include:**
  - **(i) identification of areas where local design policies will apply to take account of their special character;**
  - **(ii) provision of design guidance within development briefs and master plans for major development sites and areas of change.**

(iii) **The design of development should:**

- **(a) consider the needs of all sections of the community;**
- **(b) provide for a healthy, safe and secure environment;**
- **(c) enhance the public realm;**
- **(d) protect the amenity of residents;**
- **(e) incorporate sustainable construction techniques as detailed in Policy NR1**

Policy QL2: Priorities for the Public Realm

A concerted effort will be made to improve the appearance, design, safety and ambience of the public realm including streets, squares, walkways, green space and vistas in both town and country. This will be implemented by:

- **(i) programmes of investment in new and refurbished public spaces;**
- **(ii) the improvement of townscapes including environmental enhancement;**
- **(iii) improved maintenance of streets, squares and other open spaces;**
- **(iv) adoption of measures that foster community safety and security;**
- **(v) encouragement, as appropriate, of retail, leisure, sport and recreation, cultural and civic activity to bring vitality to the central areas of our towns and cities.**

Policy QL3: Movement and Accessibility in the Public Realm

Local authorities will establish priorities and programmes for:

a) **pedestrian priority and reduced traffic speeds within town centres, in existing residential areas and in major new development areas;**
b) **the provision of safe pedestrian and cycle routes to schools;**
c) **a network of high quality, direct and convenient pedestrian and cycle routes linking public open space, safe streets and parks in urban areas, residential areas with community facilities/services and the major/principal urban areas with the surrounding countryside;**
d) **the provision of a safe and convenient network for pedestrians and cyclists in rural areas.**

Where directly related, contributions from developments to the implementation of such programmes may be required.

Policy QL4: Maintaining the Separation and Identity of Settlements

The separation and identity of settlements will be maintained including:

a) **safeguarding of the open and undeveloped character of the countryside around and between settlements, including the use of landscape buffers;**
b) **the allocation of land at, but outside the built confines of, settlements for uses which maintain or enhance their setting;**
c) **the protection of important features, views and skylines.**

Policy QL5*:* Mix of Uses on Sites

a) **New large scale developments will include a mix of residential and employment uses, unless an appropriate mix can be achieved through proximity to, and integration with, existing development. They will incorporate appropriate community and other services if not available within walking distance or if they cannot be provided in extended facilities nearby.**

b) **Opportunities should be taken to introduce an appropriate mix of uses into existing developed areas and on major sites currently planned for single use where this would lead to a better balance in the mix of development.**

c) **Consideration of proposals for other sites should assess their potential contribution to mixed use, either within the development site itself or by complementing surrounding uses.**

Policy QL6*:* Conservation Areas

The primary planning policy towards conservation areas is to preserve or enhance their special character or appearance.

Development within conservation areas should preserve or enhance their character or appearance. Development which would harm the character or appearance of a conservation area will not be permitted.

District Planning Authorities should:

i. **include policies within local development documents that protect, within conservation areas, the plan form, buildings, architectural features, archaeological sites, trees, streets and spaces, and the relationships between these features, which contribute to their special character and setting;**

ii. **review the boundaries of existing conservation areas and, where appropriate, amend them and/or identify new conservation areas;**

iii. **carry out conservation area appraisals to identify important features or characteristics which need to be protected and develop strategies for the enhancement of conservation areas.**

Policy QL7*:* Archaeological Sites

The archaeological and historic integrity of scheduled ancient monuments and other important archaeological sites, together with their settings, will be protected and, where possible, enhanced. Development which would adversely affect them will not be permitted.

Where important or potentially important archaeological remains may exist, developers will be required to arrange for archaeological assessment and/or field evaluation to be carried out in advance of the determination of planning applications.

Where the case for development affecting an archaeological site is accepted, the archaeological remains should be preserved in situ. Where preservation in situ is not possible or justified, appropriate provision for preservation by record will be required.

Policy QL8*:* Buildings of Architectural or Historic Importance

Listed Buildings will be preserved and their architectural and historic integrity and the character of their settings will be protected and enhanced. Development which will adversely affect them will not be permitted. Changes of use will be permitted where these will provide the best reasonable means of conserving the character, appearance, fabric, integrity and setting of listed buildings.

Policy QL9: Historic Landscape Features

Development will not be permitted which would have an adverse impact upon the historic and archaeological importance, landscape character and physical appearance of historic landscapes, parks and gardens.

Historic landscape features and the settings and views into, and out of, historic landscapes, parks and gardens will be protected and where possible enhanced.

Policy QL10: Heritage Assets - Enabling Development

Development for the purposes of protecting a heritage asset will be permitted only where this is the sole means of protecting and securing the long-term future of the asset. The scale of development shall not exceed that required to achieve this objective and be in a form that minimises dis-benefits.

Policy QL11: The Protection and Enhancement of Existing Community Services

Existing community services* and recreation facilities will be protected as long as there is a demonstrable need for them. Provision will be made for the development and improvement of local services in existing residential areas and in town and district centres, particularly where services are deficient. Flexibility in the use of buildings for mixed community uses, and the concentration of sports facilities at schools, will be encouraged.

- *'community services' includes schools and other education provision, social services, adult education, libraries, youth and community services, police and emergency services, health,*

culture, places of worship, *recreation and amenity space, sport, local shopping, public utilities, and transport.*

Policy QL12: Provision for New Community Services and Infrastructure

a) Provision will be made to accommodate additional requirements for local community services* within new residential, commercial and mixed use developments or through the provision or upgrading of facilities nearby in response to:

- **Needs generated by the new development;**
- **Growth in demand from the community as a whole.**

b) Development will not be permitted until the basis for the funding of the community services it requires has been identified and agreed;

c) Provision will be made in Local Development Documents for new community facilities Specifically land will be provided for:

- **expansion of Further and/or Higher education at Canterbury and Medway and Ashford;**
- **primary and secondary schools in areas of major new dwelling provision;**
- **a new general hospital at Tunbridge Wells.**

New community services will be located where they are accessible by walking and cycling and by public transport from the area they serve. Whenever practical they will be located in town, district or local centres.

***** *'community services' includes schools and other education provision, social services, adult education, libraries, youth and community services, police and emergency services*, *health, culture, places of worship*, *recreation and amenity space, sport, local shopping, public utilities, and transport.*

Policy QL13*:* Cultural Development and the Arts

Proposals for cultural or arts facilities will be encouraged, particularly where located within, or close to town centres or public transport nodes. Development proposals in general should seek to promote public art, both directly and through the provision of development contributions.

Policy QL14*:* Provision for Major Sporting Venues

The development of high quality venues for sport to serve Kent and wider regional or national requirements will be encouraged. Assessment of the potential for such facilities will give particular emphasis to Thames Gateway and Ashford. Any such provision should be accessible to the County as a whole by a choice of transport and preferably be at a major or principal urban area.

Policy QL15*:* Formal and Informal Recreation/Sport Facilities

All major new formal recreation and sports facilities, including intensively used facilities in rural areas such as golf courses, should be accessible by a choice of transport and designed to avoid nuisance from traffic, noise and lighting.

Local Development Documents will make provision for sport, informal and formal recreation facilities taking account of the potential for dual use and/or joint provision. Where there is a

continuing need, existing facilities will be protected and where these are deficient land will be identified for improvements.

The need for new facilities within major new residential and mixed-use developments will be assessed and appropriate provision made.

Where additional facilities are needed in rural areas priority should be given to clustered provision at rural service centres.

Policy QL16: Water Recreation

Development that improves or extends water recreation in Kent will be permitted provided it causes no material harm to species, natural habitats or the wider environment.

Policy QL17: Green-Space Networks and Rights of Way

Local authorities will prepare open space strategies and reflect their land use requirements in Local Development Documents.

a) In urban areas local authorities will establish and extend green-space networks as corridors for movement by foot and cycle, as havens for wildlife and natural habitats and for leisure, amenity and recreational use. Where practicable, green linkages should be encouraged from within settlements to the open countryside.

b) Existing open space and public rights of way will be protected and improved as part of these networks which, where possible, should extend through major new development sites and connect directly with community facilities, employment areas and transport hubs.

c) The rights of way network will be protected and enhanced and the provision, protection and improvement of routes and networks open to equestrians will be supported.

Policy QL18: Strategic Green Space Initiatives

Major infrastructure programmes will be developed to maintain, enhance and extend green-space, heritage, wildlife and access initiatives:

a) in the wider rural areas of Kent Thames Gateway, especially within Gravesham and Medway, in support of the Thames Gateway regeneration initiative; and

b) in East Kent, particularly in the Lower Stour Catchment, to support regeneration and tourism.

Chapter 6: Employment and Prosperity

Policy EP1: Land, Workforce, Education and Skills

Sufficient land and floorspace will be provided throughout Kent to sustain full employment and reduce the need to travel.

The varied character of the employment land provided, together with the development of other economic sectors, will provide opportunities for the workforce as a whole.

To improve the skills and qualifications of the workforce in Kent and to support the development of the Kent economy, particularly the technology, research and knowledge based industries:

- **Land and premises will be provided for education and skills training purposes;**
- **The improvement of education and skills training will be encouraged and fostered having regard to the spatial strategy and regeneration policies of this Plan.**

Policy EP2: Employment Land Provision

(a) Priority will be given to developing sites in Kent with planning consent or identified in local plans for financial and professional services, business, industrial and warehousing uses (Use Classes A2/B1-8) as at 2001.

(b) In addition new land (or its floorspace equivalent) should be identified as follows:

- **In Medway at least 20 hectares (70,000 square metres) for a wide range of employment uses, including the knowledge and technology sectors, as part of mixed use development at Chattenden/Lodge Hill;**
- **At Canterbury City up to 10 hectares to provide specifically for knowledge and technology uses linked to the higher education sector in Canterbury and up to 20 hectares (70,000 square metres) for office accommodation and business development within Use Classes B1(a) and B1(b) at the city;**
- **At Herne Bay-Whitstable up to 10 hectares (35,000 square metres) to ensure a continuing supply of land for the relocation and expansion of local firms and to attract inward investment to the coastal towns;**
- **In Shepway provision of up to 20 hectares (70,000 square metres) to improve choice and support inward investment;**
- **At Ashford further employment land will be provided where required to give support, for the longer term, to its role as a regional growth point based on balanced employment and housing growth;**

(c) Accordingly the total provision for net additional floorspace provision for financial and professional services, business, industrial and warehousing uses will be:

Local Authority Area	Net Commitment at 2001 (000's sq.m)	New Provision (000's sq.m)	Total 2001-21 (000's sq. m)
Ashford	592		592
Canterbury	161	140	301
Dartford	892		892
Dover	512**		512**
Gravesham	435		435
Maidstone	129		129

Sevenoaks	**84**		**84**
Shepway	**162**	**70**	**232**
Swale	**938**		**900&**
Thanet	**304**		**304**
Tonbridge & Malling	**359**		**284#**
Tunbridge Wells	**74**		**74**
KCC Area	**4,642**	**210**	**4,739**
Medway	**505**	**70**	**575**
Kent	**5,147**	**280**	**5,314**

(d) Existing employment sites that are well located and otherwise well suited to employment use should be retained for this purpose. Existing commitments may be reviewed through Local Development Documents. Sites which have not succeeded because of constraints or poor quality may be replaced by alternative, more marketable and better located allocations provided that this:

- **does not prejudice the scale and implementation of strategic locations for business development supported and safeguarded by this Plan (Policy EP4);**
- **does not conflict with other Structure Plan policies.**

Measures, including investment by the public and private sectors to provide serviced sites and/or land reclamation, should be taken to bring forward sites that the market alone would not develop. Schemes will be encouraged to improve unattractive sites where this is a main reason for their lack of investment.

(e) Local Development Documents should identify land for the appropriate location of businesses likely to cause environmental disturbance, particularly in residential or mixed use areas.

(f) Employment uses other than those covered by Policy EP2 (but excluding retail and leisure) may be included on the major sites provided that this does not conflict with the policies of this Plan, notably in respect of the location of major generators of travel demand.

(g) Business and commercial development should secure the efficient use of land including the redevelopment of low density uses especially where located within the major/principal urban areas.

NOTES TO POLICY EP2:

*** Includes land at Richborough-Sandwich previously occupied by a variety of uses and now available for redevelopment.*
 # Figures for Tonbridge and Malling allow for revised mix of land uses at Kings Hill and reduced B1 content pursuant to Policies HP1 and TM1.
& Figures for Swale allow for some rationalisation of business floorspace at Faversham pursuant to Policy SW1

Net Commitments include net completions 2001-2002, local plan allocations at 2002, net planning permissions at 2002 and vacant plots within existing employment sites.

New provision based on 3,500 sq. m per hectare.

Policy EP3: Location of New or Replacement Employment Land

Proposals for employment and business development other than (a) those already identified in adopted local plans or (b) at the specific locations identified in Policy EP5 (b) or identified pursuant to Policy EP7, should be located in, or adjacent to, major or principal urban areas and be easily accessible by a choice of transport. Such proposals should be attractive to the market place.

Policy EP4: Locations of Strategic Importance for Business, Industrial or Distribution Uses

In contributing to the provisions of Policy EP2 the safeguarding and implementation of the following strategic employment locations will have priority:

- **Ashford: Eureka Science Park**
- **Ashford: South East Sector including or replacing land at Orbital Park, Waterbrook and Cheeseman's Green**
- **Dartford: North Dartford (including Fresh Marshes)**
- **Dartford: Crossways Business Park**
- **Dartford: Eastern Quarry**
- **Dartford/Gravesham: Ebbsfleet**
- **Dover: Land at Richborough**
- **Dover: White Cliffs Business Park**
- **Shepway: Shearway Business Park: Folkestone**
- **Swale: Neatscourt: Queenborough**
- **Swale: Lappel Bank: Sheerness**
- **Swale: Ridham Kemsley**
- **Swale: Eurolink: Sittingbourne**
- **Thanet: Eurokent**
- **Thanet: Manston Park**
- **Tonbridge and Malling: Kings Hill***
- **Medway: Kingsnorth and Grain**
- **Medway: Adjacent to Rochester Airfield**

*Subject to the provisions of Policy TM1

Policy EP5: Land for Technology and Knowledge Clusters

High quality proposals for intensification or expansion in the technology and knowledge sectors will be supported at the following locations unless there are overriding environmental impacts which cannot be adequately mitigated:

(a) a new site at Canterbury linked to the University (pursuant to Policy EP2);

(b) expansion of technology and knowledge activities at:

- **Fort Halstead (Sevenoaks District);**
- **East Malling Research;**
- **Kings Hill;**
- **Pfizer and land in the Sandwich Corridor at Richborough;**
- **Kent Science Park;**
- **Chatham Maritime; and**
- **Adjacent to Rochester Airfield.**

(c) the expansion, at existing locations, of other key employers in the technology and knowledge sectors.

Policy EP6: Premises for Small Firms

Premises for small firms will be provided:
(a) within larger industrial estates;
(b) within new mixed-use developments;
(c) as part of clusters of similar economic activity (pursuant to Policy EP5);
(d) through the development of small infill sites;
(e) through the conversion or alteration of suitable existing buildings; and
(f) through the protection of existing employment land.

Development at these locations should demonstrate good accessibility from the primary or secondary route network.

Policy EP7: Development of Employment Uses in Rural Areas

Provision for small scale business development (B1-B8) and service industries should be made within, or adjoining, the built up area of Rural Service Centres (identified on the Key Diagram) or of larger villages that can provide a sustainable form of development. Development should be appropriate to the scale of the settlement and without detriment to its amenity, character or setting. In this context small scale live/work units may be acceptable.

No provision for business development will be made elsewhere in rural Kent except where:

i) it involves the re-use, adaptation or redevelopment of an existing building, as covered by Policy SS8(ii); or
ii) it is required for the expansion of an established business and/or for the processing, storage, distribution or promotion and research concerning produce from Kent agriculture, horticulture or forestry;

and good access can be provided to the primary road network and bus or rail services

The role of the Kent Agricultural Showground at Detling is recognised as important and requiring enhancement so as to promote more widely the land based economy of Kent and the region.

All development supported within the terms of this policy should have no unacceptably adverse impact on the local transport network, the environment or the Green Belt and will be subject to the restriction of subsequent expansion if in conflict with the policies of this Plan.

Policy EP8: Farm Diversification

Conversion, alteration or re-use of existing farm buildings to support agriculture, horticulture and forestry based on Kent, or other locally sourced produce, will be permitted where the traffic and environmental impacts are acceptable and it is demonstrated that the proposal is:

(a) necessary for the efficiency or viability of an existing business or required for a new agriculture, horticulture or forestry business; or
(b) a suitable small-scale non-agricultural use which secures the viability of a farm; or
(c) suitable land based activity.

New small-scale buildings or replacement buildings for the above purposes may be permitted if no existing buildings exist which could be converted, provided that they are of a scale and design appropriate to their rural surroundings and there are no overriding environmental constraints.

All such proposals should be supported by a business case or farm plan which demonstrates effective management of the farm in the long-term.

Policy EP9: Protection of Agricultural Land

a) In order to protect the long term productive potential of agriculture, development of agricultural land will only take place when there is an overriding need identified in the Development Plan which cannot be accommodated within the major/principal urban areas, rural service centres or on other previously developed land;

b) Best and most versatile agricultural land (DEFRA Grades 1, 2 and 3a) will be protected from development unless:

- **there is no alternative site on land of poorer agricultural quality; or**
- **alternative sites have greater value for their landscape, biodiversity, amenity, heritage or natural resources; or**
- **the land proposed for development is more accessible to infrastructure, the workforce or markets than the alternatives.**

Policy EP10*:* Sustainable Tourism Development

Development of tourism facilities, such as accommodation and visitor attractions, will be supported if:

(a) they are designed to a high standard which enhances their setting and the attraction of Kent as a tourist destination; and
(b) there are clear economic advantages to Kent; and
(c) there are no adverse environmental impacts or such impacts are capable of being adequately mitigated; and
(d) they reduce dependence on the private car and access is possible by a choice of means of transport, particularly by public transport, cycling and walking; and
(e) equal access is provided for all social, economic and cultural groups and to people with disabilities.

Policy EP11: Tourism Development and Regeneration

(a) New tourist attractions and the upgrading of existing tourism facilities in the major/principal urban areas will be supported, particularly if located in, or near to, a centre within the strategic hierarchy of centres in Kent as identified on the Key Diagram and in Table EP4, where they assist regeneration and cause no harm to the environment or to the amenity of nearby residential areas.

(b) Priority will be given to such development:

- **within Kent Thames Gateway;**
- **at the coastal resorts of East Kent;**
- **at Ashford.**

(c) Proposals for new buildings or for the refurbishment of buildings of historic interest, particularly in "clusters", for arts or cultural use will be supported where they cause no environmental harm.

(d) Historic inns and pubs should be retained in this use unless a change of use is demonstrated to be necessary to secure their future.

(e) Environmentally related tourism initiatives will be encouraged.

Policy EP12: Tourist Accommodation

(a) Sites for the development of high quality tourist, business and conference hotels and for budget hotels will be identified as first priority in, or adjacent to, centres within the strategic hierarchy of centres as identified on the Key Diagram and in Table EP4;

(b) Proposals for hotel development must demonstrate that they will have no significant adverse environmental or transport impact;

(b) Proposals which would result in the loss, without replacement, of good quality accommodation will not be permitted unless there is overriding economic advantage to the area from the development;

(d) The conversion or extension of existing buildings to provide small hotels, bed and breakfast or self catering accommodation will be permitted provided this causes no harm to the local environment;

(e) The improvement of touring and static caravan and camping sites will be permitted if the development benefits the local environment.

Policy EP13: Major Tourism/Visitor Attractions

Proposals for major tourism/visitor attractions in Kent of national or regional significance will be encouraged. All such developments should be of an exceptionally high standard of design and landscaping.

The priority for the location of such development is within the urban areas of Thames Gateway, Ashford or the coastal towns of East Kent.

The location, and associated land take, of proposals outside the major/principal urban areas will require exceptional justification and should demonstrate that the development:

- **is capable of bringing major benefits to Kent's economy; and**
- **will make an important contribution to diversifying and upgrading the tourism and visitor attractions in the county; and**
- **is well related to the passenger rail and primary road networks; and**
- **is located so as to minimise its impact on the environment including landscape, wildlife, the best and most versatile agricultural land and areas of archaeological and historic importance; and**
- **incorporates satisfactory provision for mitigation of adverse impacts on the locality.**

Policy EP14: Development at the Network of Strategic Centres

The role of regional, sub regional, principal and urban and rural service centres forming the strategic hierarchy of retail and service centres in Kent, as identified on the Key Diagram and in Table EP4, will be safeguarded. Development proposals which enhance the quality,

range and choice of shopping and/or expand or diversify their service, business or leisure activities will be supported.

Development should achieve a high standard of design and enhance the visual quality, functioning and environment of a centre.

Local authorities will:

- **(a) include policies in Local Development Documents to support the retail function of these centres including the allocation of suitable sites or areas for retail and/or mixed use development to meet identified needs;**
- **(b) identify measures to improve the environment and functioning of centres including pedestrian priority zones and networks and public transport access and interchange arrangements;**
- **(c) pursue measures including, where necessary, compulsory purchase to make town centre sites available for planned development.**

Table EP4: The Strategic Hierarchy of Retail and Service Centres in Kent

REGIONAL CENTRE				
Bluewater				
SUB REGIONAL TOWN AND CITY CENTRES				
Ashford	Canterbury	Chatham	Maidstone	Tunbridge Wells
PRINCIPAL TOWN CENTRES				
Dartford	Folkestone	Sevenoaks	Sittingbourne	Westwood (Thanet)
Dover	Gravesend	Tonbridge		
URBAN SERVICE CENTRES				
Broadstairs	Hempstead Valley	Margate	Rochester	Southborough
Deal	Herne Bay	Rainham	Sheerness	Swanley
Faversham	Hythe	Ramsgate	Strood	Whitstable
Gillingham				
RURAL SERVICE CENTRES				
Borough Green	Hawkhurst	Lydd	Staplehurst	Westerham
Cranbrook	Headcorn	New Romney	Sandwich	West Malling
Edenbridge	Hoo St Werburgh	Paddock Wood	Tenterden	
District and Local Centres: To be defined in Local Development Documents				

Policy EP15: Sequential Consideration of Sites for Retail and Leisure Development

New retail and leisure development should be located on sites within centres forming the strategic hierarchy of retail and service centres in Kent, as identified in the Key Diagram and in Table EP4, taking account of the scale of development proposed in relation to the size and function of the centre. If there are no suitable sites or buildings that are, or will become, available then sites on the edge of these centres may be considered.

In the absence of edge of centre sites, development of large food or bulky goods stores may be considered at out of centre locations but within the confines of a major/principal urban area. Where possible such developments should be located at, or adjacent to, existing major out of centre retail developments.

Development (including extensions to existing retail development) on the edge of, or outside the strategic centres must demonstrate that:

- **there is a need for the development; and**
- **more suitable sites do not exist within the strategic centres, or on their edge; and**
- **individually or cumulatively the development does not undermine the viability or vitality of existing strategic or other centres; and**
- **the development is accessible to a choice of public and private transport, and by walking and cycling; and**
- **the development will not prejudice readily available and accessible sites identified for housing, business and industrial development.**

Policy EP16: Development for Core Comparison Goods Shopping

a) Development of comparison goods shopping in the sub-regional and principal town centres will be supported, particularly at:
(i) Maidstone;
(ii) Chatham;
(iii) Ashford;
(iv) Tunbridge Wells;
(v) Folkestone;
(vi) Dover;
(vii) Sittingbourne.

b) The scale and character of development at Canterbury should not prejudice investment in, and strengthening of, the strategic centres in East Kent and development of Ashford as a sub regional centre.

c) Any development at Bluewater should not prejudice investment in, and strengthening of, the sub regional centres of Chatham and Maidstone nor conflict with the role of principal town centres in North Kent as the prime focus for local retail, service, cultural and leisure facilities.

d) Development of a new town centre for Thanet at Westwood, adjacent to, and integrated with, existing major retail provision will be supported.

Policy EP17: Development of Large Food Stores

Proposals for large new food stores should be located in accordance with the sequential approach of Policy EP15.

Local Development Documents will:

(i) identify and allocate sites for such development;
(ii) identify where new or improved convenience shopping, which cannot be accommodated within the strategic centres, is needed:
(a) to make good deficiencies in the quality or amount of existing provision; or
(b) to meet new requirements associated with major new residential communities including the Strategic Development Locations identified by this Plan.

Policy EP18: Urban and Rural Service Centres

An appropriate scale of retail and service provision at the urban and rural service centres (as identified on the Key Diagram and in Table EP4), and at district, local, neighbourhood and village centres identified within Local Development Documents, will be supported where it will underpin the role, vitality and viability of such centres.

Local Development Documents will identify the locations of new district or local centres of a suitable scale that are needed to serve large scale residential or mixed use development.

Chapter 7: Housing Provision and Distribution

Policy HP1: Housing Provision and Distribution 2001- 2016

Provision for housing for 2001- 2016 will be made in accordance with the following quantities:

	Dwellings (net)			
	2001 - 2006	2006 - 2011	2011 - 2016	2001 - 2016
Ashford	3,500	5,000	5,500	14,000*
Canterbury	2,100	2,300	2,200	6,600
Dartford	3,900	4,000	4,500	12,400
Dover	1,600	1,600	2,200	5,400+
Gravesham	1,400	1,500	1,500	4,400
Maidstone	2,300	2,200	2,000	6,500@
Sevenoaks	800	800	800	2,400
Shepway	1,800	1,500	1,400	4,700
Swale	2,700	3,200	3,200	9,100
Thanet	1,700	2,100	2,200	6,000
Tonbridge & Malling	2,200	2,200	2,400	6,800
Tunbridge Wells	1,500	1,400	1,100	4,000
(KCC area)	25,500	27,800	29,000	82,300
Medway	3,500	3,900	4,100	11,500#
Kent	29,000	31,700	33,100	93,800

**** including provision for 13,100 dwellings 2001-2016 at the Ashford growth point***
+ includes provision for up to 1,000 dwellings at Aylesham

@ The HP1 quantity for Maidstone Borough is a minimum. Any increase in housing provision will be governed by study of urban capacity and identification of sustainably located sites through the preparation of Local Development Documents.

 # The housing quantity for Medway reflects the scale of development expected to occur by 2016 given the complexity of the key urban regeneration sites and the development programme for the proposed new settlement at Chattenden/Lodge Hill. Should a higher rate of development prove to be feasible on these sites this will be considered, subject to the provision of necessary infrastructure and services in accordance with an agreed development strategy for each site.

Notes to Policy HP1

The quantities in Policy HP1 include all forms of housing development providing self contained dwelling units for permanent accommodation and relate to net increases to the housing stock after 31st March 2001 i.e. net of demolitions or other losses from the housing stock. In order to secure the overall average annual rate of provision for the 2001/2016 period the quantities for the three phasing periods to 2016 are cumulative i.e. any surplus or shortfall from the early periods of the Plan are carried forward to subsequent periods.

For the purposes of implementing Policy HP1 housing provision will mean the expected net dwelling capacity of planning permissions and allocations in previously adopted or deposited development plans which were outstanding at 31st March 2001 (including dwellings then under construction) plus the planned net dwelling capacity on sites subsequently released or to be released for development through allocations in development plans and planning permissions. The assessment of the level of provision in relation to Policy HP1 will also allow for:

(i) the expected contribution from sites below the site size threshold adopted for the identification of development plan allocations; and

(ii) the expected contribution from other windfall sites involving previously developed land.

Table HP1: Annual Average Rates of Housing Provision By Phases: 2001- 2016

	Dwellings (net) ++			
	2001 – 2006	2006 – 2011	2011 - 2016	**2001 - 2016**
Ashford	700	1,000	1,100	**930**
Canterbury	420	460	440	**440**
Dartford	780	800	900	**825**
Dover	320	320	440	**360**
Gravesham	280	300	300	**295**
Maidstone	460	440	400	**435**
Sevenoaks	160	160	160	**160**
Shepway	360	300	280	**315**
Swale	540	640	640	**605**
Thanet	340	420	440	**400**
Tonbridge & Malling	440	440	480	**455**
Tunbridge Wells	300	280	220	**270**
(KCC area)	5,100	5,560	5,800	**5,490**
Medway	700	780	820	**765**
Kent	5,800	6,340	6,620	**6250**

++ Rounded to the nearest five

Policy HP2: Housing Provision: Phasing, Assessment and Sequential Approach to Location

A. Each local planning authority will phase and manage the release of sites for housing development to ensure that:

- **Provision accords with the requirements of the growth areas and area based policies specified in this Plan;**
- **the housing requirements for each District for each of the phasing periods set out in Policy HP1 are met; and**
- **generally, previously developed sites are identified before greenfield sites.**

B In identifying sites to be allocated, and in the control of development, the suitability of both previously developed and greenfield sites for housing development should demonstrate:

a) good quality accessibility to jobs, shops and services by means other than the car, including the potential for improving such accessibility; and

b) adequate capacity within existing transport, utility, social and community infrastructure to absorb further development or the ability for new or enhanced facilities to be provided; and

c) the role of development in sustaining local services and facilities; and

d) the absence of material harm arising from physical and environmental constraints affecting the development of the land.

C. Subject to sites meeting the criteria in part B of this policy, a search sequence will be applied in identifying sites to be allocated within each District as follows:

1) The re-use of previously developed land and buildings:
   a) within Major/ Principal Urban Areas; followed by:
   b) within Rural Service Centres; followed by:
   c) within a smaller rural settlement, as defined in Local Development Documents;

   followed by:

2) Settlement extensions or new communities where identified as Strategic Development Locations by this Plan:

   followed by:

3) An extension or extensions to:
   a) a major/principal urban area; followed by:
   b) a rural service centre; followed by:
   c) a smaller rural settlement, as defined in Local Development Documents.

Where practical, consideration of a settlement extension, under 3) above, should give priority to the use of previously developed land.

<u>Policy HP3: Contribution of Previously Developed Land and Previously Used Buildings to Housing Provision: 2001-2016</u>

The Local Planning Authorities will test, through the conduct of urban capacity studies and the formulation of Local Plans/Local Development Documents, the following indicative target for the proportionate contribution of dwellings from previously developed land or the re-use of previously used buildings to the housing provisions of Policy HP1 for the 2001-2016 period.

	Total Housing Provision 2001-2016	Target for Previously Developed Land /Previously Used Buildings (%)
Kent	**93,800**	**70**

<u>Policy HP4: Housing: Quality and Density of Development</u>

In conjunction with the delivery of high quality design and to secure efficient use of land, residential development should:

- **avoid densities* below 30 dwellings per hectare;**
- **achieve densities* above 50 dwellings per hectare in central urban areas and in locations with good public transport accessibility or in conjunction with public transport oriented development;**
- **otherwise, realise densities* of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare;**

Housing development should secure the efficient use of land including, where appropriate, the redevelopment of low-density uses especially where located within the central parts of the major/principal urban areas.

***Densities apply to the net area of land for residential use excluding major distributor roads, primary schools, open spaces serving a wider area, significant landscape buffer strips and other uses.*

Policy HP5: Housing Development in the Countryside

Housing development outside the confines of the major/principal urban areas will not be permitted unless it is:

a) a site allocated for housing development in a Local Development Document; or otherwise consistent with Policy SS8; or
b) minor development within the confines of a Rural Service Centre or smaller rural settlement; or
c) a single dwelling for farm, forestry or other workers where a rural location at, or in the immediate vicinity of, a place of work is essential; or
d) the rebuilding, conversion or modest extension of a dwelling currently in residential use; or
e) the conversion of a commercial, institutional, industrial or other rural building to meet an identified local need for housing which does not conflict with a need to retain local employment opportunities and is in a location that has good accessibility to a range of services in a nearby settlement.

Housing development must not be detrimental to the character of the countryside and, as appropriate, the character of rural settlement.

Policy HP6: Range and Mix of Housing Provision

The provision made for housing in Local Plans/Local Development Documents and through development proposals should secure a mix of dwelling sizes and types which will contribute towards meeting the identified needs of all sections of the community. As appropriate this should include:

a) sheltered housing;
b) supported and lifetime housing;
c) student accommodation allied to the needs of the higher and further education sectors in Kent.

Policy HP7: Affordable Housing Provision

Provision of all affordable housing involving net additions to the housing stock will contribute to meeting the housing quantities in Policy HP1.
Local Development Documents should:

a) establish the proportion of strategic housing provisions identified in Policy HP1 that should be met by affordable housing on the basis of District housing needs assessments;
b) identify the respective contributions planned for shared equity, key worker and other forms of intermediate housing;

c) **indicate the site size thresholds that will apply to provision of affordable housing and provide indicative targets for the level and composition of the contribution required from specific sites.**

Policy HP8: Affordable Housing on Rural Exception Sites

Local Development Documents should indicate those rural settlements at which the provision of affordable housing would be acceptable on sites that have not been allocated for housing but where such development would be justified to meet a proven local need.

HP9: Provision of Permanent and Transit Gypsy Accommodation

Where a need for permanent or transit gypsy accommodation is established, provision should be in accordance with the Structure Plan's policies for protection of the environment, countryside and the Green Belt.

Sites should be provided within the major/principal urban areas or rural settlements. In the absence of such sites, locations with good accessibility to the major/principal urban areas or rural service centres and with easy and safe access to primary and other main roads will be preferred.

Proposals should be located to avoid adverse impact on residential amenity, highway capacity and highway safety.

Chapter 8: Promoting Quality , Choice and Accessibility in the Transport Network

Policy TP1: Integrated Transport Strategy

The Transport strategy of this Plan is designed to further the overall planning strategy for Kent. Consequently, priorities for transport will include:

- **promotion of a pattern and form of development that reduces the need to travel and is served by a choice of means of transport;**
- **co-ordination of an accessibility strategy to enable individuals and communities to access employment, health care, education, leisure and food shops;**
- **maintenance, and making efficient use, of the existing transport network; and**
- **provision of travel choice and alternatives to the private car, including public transport, walking and cycling.**

Policy TP2: Assessment Criteria for Transport Proposals

Proposals for enhancing the transport network in Kent and Medway will be assessed according to their social, transport, economic and environmental effects with specific regard to:

- **the relationship to the overall strategy of this Plan;**
- **the contribution towards achieving a more sustainable pattern of development and regeneration;**
- **the likely impact on the environment including areas of special environmental quality;**
- **the likely effects on air quality and carbon dioxide emissions;**
- **noise impacts;**
- **reducing dependence on the private car;**
- **the economic and operational benefits likely to be achieved relative to the cost of the proposal;**
- **the contribution to the movement of passengers and freight by rail;**
- **the need to concentrate traffic on the most suitable routes;**
- **consideration of existing local road congestion**
- **the impact on road casualty reductions;**
- **the need to maintain or improve town centre accessibility by sustainable means;**
- **the need to accommodate improvements for bus services, pedestrians and cyclists; and**
- **the ability to enhance the environment for local communities.**

Policy TP3: Transport and the Location of Development

Local Planning Authorities should ensure that development sites are well served by public transport, walking and cycling, or will be made so as a result of the development. Travel plans should be established for larger developments that generate significant demand for travel to promote the use of these means of transport.

Developments likely to generate a large number of trips should be located where there is either a good choice of transport already available or where a good choice can be provided in a manner acceptable to the Local Transport Authority.

Policy TP4: Safeguarding of Programmed Strategic Transport Schemes

The programmed major transport schemes listed in Table TP4 will be promoted and land required for their construction safeguarded.

Table TP4: Programmed Strategic Transport Schemes

SCHEMES	(Likely) Start Date	(Likely) Finish Date	LINKS TO OTHER PLAN POLICIES/PROPOSALS
RAIL (1)			
Upgraded Power Supply	2003	2005	SS1, TP9
Channel Tunnel Rail Link	1998	2007	SS1, DG1, ME1, SW1, CA1, DO1, TH1, AS1, SH1. TP9, TP20
East Kent Re-signalling Scheme	2008	2011	SS1, TP9
Thameslink 2000 providing direct services to Dartford/Sevenoaks /Ashford	2007	2012	SS1, DG1,TP9
TRUNK ROADS (2)			
A249 Iwade to Queenborough Including 2nd Swale Crossing	2004	2006	SS1, SW1, EP2, EP4, HP1, TP20,TP22,TP23
M20 Junction 10 Improvement	2006	2006	SS1, AS1, EP2, EP4 HP1,
A2/A282 Dartford Improvement	2005/6	2007/8	SS1, DG1
A2 Bean-Cobham Phase 2	2005/6	2007/8	SS1, DG1, EP2,HP1
M20 New Junction 10a	2008/9	2010/11	SS1, AS1, EP2, EP4, HP1
M25 (Junctions 1b – 3)	2006/7	2008/9	SS1, DG1,TP2
M25 (Junctions 5 – 7)	Post 2008		TP2 To alleviate congestion, safety and environmental problems
A21 Tonbridge Bypass to Pembury Bypass Improvement	Post 2008		TP2 To alleviate congestion, safety and environmental problems and to support the regional priority to assist the regeneration of Hastings
A21 Kippings Cross to Lamberhurst	Post 2008		TP2 To alleviate congestion, safety and environmental problems and to support the regional priority to assist the regeneration of Hastings
LOCALTRANSPORT PLAN SCHEMES (3)			
A256 East Kent Access Phase 1 (Sandwich – Ebbsfleet Lane)	2003	2007	SS1, DO1, TH1, EP2, EP4, EP5, HP1
Fastrack Phase 1 (Dartford town centre – Darenth Park - Bluewater – Greenhithe - A226 - Gravesend town centre)	2004	2006	SS1, DG1, EP2, EP4, HP1, TP9

A228 Main Road to Ropers Lane	**2003**	**2005**	**SS1, ME1, EP2, EP4, TP22**
A228 Leybourne & West Malling Corridor Improvement (including M20 Junction 4)	**2005**	**2007**	**TM1, EP2, EP4, EP5, HP1,TP12**
Sittingbourne Northern Distributor Road (sections between Ridham Avenue and East Hall Farm)	**2005/6**	**2009/10**	**SS1, SW1, EP2, EP4, HP1**

(1) Schemes listed in Transport 2010.
(2) Schemes in the Highways Agency's Targeted Programme of Improvements (TPI)
(3) Schemes included in Local Transport Plans for Kent and Medway (2001/02 – 2005/6) and provisionally accepted by Government (subject to completion of statutory procedures).

Policy TP5: Support for Strategic Rail Schemes

Kent County Council and Medway Council will press Government to implement the rail schemes listed in Table TP5 within the Plan period.

Table TP5: Strategic Rail Schemes

SCHEMES	LINKS TO OTHER POLICIES/COMMENTS	POSSIBLE TIMING
SCHEMES IDENTIFIED IN MULTI MODAL STUDIES		
Increased rail capacity/capability around/through London	**SS1, DG1, TP7, TP9, TP20** **To help overcome the barrier effect of London for freight and passengers**	**Post 2016**
South Coast Corridor rail capacity improvements (including Ashford – Hastings)	**SS1, AS1, TP9** **To improve the accessibility of Ashford from the South Coast**	**2011-2015**
OTHER SCHEMES		
Domestic passenger services via the CTRL from/to East and North Kent towns as far as Thanet and Dover	**SS1, DG1, ME1, SW1, CA1, DO1, TH1, AS1, SH1, TP4 ,TP9** **To help areas in need of regeneration and to service the growth areas**	**From 2009**
Thameslink 2000: extension of services to Gravesend and Maidstone	**SS1, DG1, MA1, TP4, TP9** **To extend services to Gravesend and Ebbsfleet as a regional transport hub. Also to Maidstone to improve connectivity of this regional transport hub to London**	**From 2012**
Crossrail: extension of services to Ebbsfleet and Medway	**SS1, DG1, ME1,TP9** **To extend services to regional transport hubs of Ebbsfleet and Chatham and to stimulate economic regeneration in the Thames Gateway.**	**From 2013**
Integration of Ebbsfleet mainline, Ebbsfleet North Kent line platforms, possible Crossrail station and Northfleet Station (1)	**SS1, DG1, TP4, TP9**	**By 2009**
Ashford –Thanet journey time improvements on existing line	**SS1, AS1, TH1, TP9** **To increase the attractiveness of rail to serve the Ashford Growth Area and**	**Post 2016**

	Thanet regeneration priority area	
North Kent Line (Dartford – Slade Green and Rochester Bridge) rail capacity improvements	**SS1, DG1, ME1, TP9** **To increase the number of rail services to/from the Thames Gateway Growth area**	**Post 2016**
Medway Valley Line - improved junctions at Strood and Paddock Wood	**SS1, TP9** **To improve connectivity of rail services and link possible Lower Thames Rail Crossing to the Channel Tunnel for rail freight services**	**Post 2016**
Rail Access to Manston Airport (1)	**SS1, TH1, TP9, TP24** **To connect Manston Airport directly to the rail network.**	**Post 2016**
Dover Western Docks Rail Freight Link (1)	**SS1, DO1, TP13, TP20, TP22, TP23** **To promote transfer of freight from road to rail and provide additional rail connection across the Channel to compete with and complement the Channel Tunnel**	**2006 – 2010**
Sheerness Docks Rail Freight Capability Improvements (1)	**SS1, SW1, TP13, TP20, TP22, TP23** **To promote transfer of freight from road to rail**	**Post 2016**
Thamesport – London Rail Freight Capability Improvements (1)	**SS1, ME1, TP13, TP20, TP22, TP23** **To promote transfer of freight from road to rail**	**2011-2015**
Holborough – rail connection to Medway Cement Works (1)	**TP13**	**Post-2011**

(1) Schemes funded in whole or in part by development

Policy TP6: Major Transport Corridors

Kent County Council and Medway Council will press Government, the Regional Assembly and, where appropriate, the Highways Agency to identify and implement integrated transport solutions to the existing and predicted congestion problems on the sections of the Motorway & Trunk Road network listed in Table TP6.

Table TP6: Existing or Predicted Problems on the Motorway & Trunk Road Network Requiring Integrated Transport Solutions

TRANSPORT CORRIDOR	LINKS TO OTHER POLICIES/COMMENTS	POSSIBLE START
SCHEMES INCLUDED IN THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY (2004)		
A2 Bean Interchange	**SS1, DG1, EP2, EP4, HP1, TP12** **To provide access between the major development sites in Kent Thameside and the A2**	**2008-2010**
A2 Lydden – Dover	**SS1, DO1, TP20, TP22, TP23** **To regenerate Dover and provide reliable and safe access to the port via the M2 corridor.**	**2011-2016**

A21 Lamberhurst – Flimwell **A21 Flimwell – Robertsbridge (Kent section)**	**TP2** **To alleviate congestion, safety and environmental problems and to support the regional priority to assist the regeneration of Hastings**	**2011-2016**
SCHEMES FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT JULY 2003)		
M25 Junction 5 Improvement Sevenoaks	**TP2** **To enable a direct link between the M26 and A21 trunk road and thus relieve the settlements on the A25 from through traffic**	**Post 2011**
ROADS SUBJECT TO EXISTING CONGESTION (1)		
M20 Junctions 3 – 5	**TP2, SS1,TP20** **To alleviate significant congestion and safety problems on key international gateway route.**	**Post 2011**
A282 Dartford Crossing	**SS1, DG1, TP7, TP20** **Solution could be provision of a Lower Thames Crossing**	**Post 2016**
ROADS SUBJECT TO HEAVY STRESS LEVELS IN 2010 (1)		
M20 Junctions 7 – 8	**TP2, SS1, TP20** **To alleviate significant congestion and safety problems on key international gateway route.**	**Post 2016**
M25 Junction 3-5	**TP2**	**Post 2016**
M20 Wrotham Hill	**TP2, TP20**	**Post 2016**
ADDITIONAL TRANSPORT CORRIDORS POTENTIALLY UNDER PRESSURE IN THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN GROWTH AREAS OF KENT THAMES GATEWAY AND ASHFORD		
A2 (M25 – M2)	**SS1, DG1** **Future growth in the Thames Gateway could put this section of the improved A2 under pressure**	**Post 2016**
M20 Junction 9 and Section 9 – 10	**SS1, AS1, TP20** **Future growth of Ashford could put these parts of the M20 under pressure**	**Post 2016**
OTHER NETWORK PROBLEMS		
M2/A2/A299 Brenley Corner Junction	**SS1, TP2** **To alleviate significant congestion and safety problems**	**Post 2011**
M2 Junction 5, Stockbury	**SS1, SW1,TP2** **To alleviate significant congestion and safety problems**	**Post 2011**

A2 Canterbury Bypass Junctions	**SS1, CA1** **To enable all movements at the three interchanges on the Bypass enabling redistribution of traffic in and around the city.**	**Post 2011**
A20 Town Wall Street, Dover	**SS1, DO1, TP20, TP22** **To regenerate Dover and provide reliable and safe access to the port.**	**Post 2011**

(1) Stress levels identified or forecast by Highways Agency

Policy TP7: Further Thames Crossing

The strategic planning and transport authorities (Kent County Council and Medway Council) will seek to ensure that Government investigates fully, and quickly, the need for, and location of, a further multi modal crossing of the River Thames for passengers and freight, taking into account:

- **the transport, economic and regeneration benefits to Kent;**
- **the balance of beneficial and adverse impacts on Kent communities and the well being of settlements including potential air quality and noise impacts;**
- **the protection of the nationally and internationally important natural environment to the east of Gravesend;**
- **the ability to integrate a crossing with the existing road and rail network in Kent and the impacts associated with any consequential links with these networks.**

In reaching a judgement as to whether there is a net benefit to Kent of a further crossing the strategic planning authorities will take into account the criteria of Policy TP2.

Policy TP8: Future Strategic Transport Schemes

The Local Planning Authorities will safeguard land for the major transport schemes listed in Table TP8, which may be promoted through the respective Local Transport Plans for Kent and Medway. These schemes will be subject to multi-modal scheme appraisal and will also be subject to Policy TP2.

Table TP8: Other Strategic Transport Schemes to be Promoted Through Local Transport Plans

SCHEMES	LINKS TO OTHER POLICIES/COMMENTS	EARLIEST POSSIBLE START
SCHEMES IN CURRENT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLANS		
A228 Colts Hill Strategic Link	**TP2** **To complete improvements to A228 Primary Route between A26 and A21 and to relieve congestion and safety problems and to bypass severed community**	**2008/9**
East Kent Access Phase 2	**SS1, DO1, TH1, HP1, EP2, EP4, EP5** **To help regenerate Thanet and the Sandwich Corridor**	**2008/9**

A228 Ropers Lane to Grain	**SS1, ME1, EP2, EP4, TP20, TP22** **To complete improvements to A228 between the A289 and Grain to facilitate development at Grain and to improve road safety.**	**2008**
SCHEMES IN SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN GROWTH AREAS OF KENT THAMES GATEWAY; ASHFORD #		
Kent Thameside: Fastrack Future Phases (including North Dartford, Stone, Eastern Quarry, Northfleet Riverside, Ebbsfleet, Swanscombe Peninsula, Thames Way)	**SS1, DG1, EP2, EP4, HP1, TP9, TP3** **To link new development in Kent Thameside to the *Fastrack* core network provided by Phase 1, started in 2004**	**Phasing 2005 to 2018**
Kent Thameside: London Road/St. Clements Way Junction	**SS1, DG1, HP1,EP2** **To facilitate development of Eastern Quarry, Stone Castle, St Clements Way and Swanscombe Peninsula**	**2009**
Kent Thameside: Denton Relief Road	**SS1, SS4, DG1, HP1** **To help regenerate the Canal Basin in NE Gravesend**	**2008**
Transport for Medway (Integrated Network Development and provision of substantial public transport capacity)	**SS1, ME1, EP2 EP4, HP1,TP9,TP3** **To help regenerate the Medway Towns**	**2008**
Ashford: Smartlink bus priority schemes	**SS1, AS1, EP2, EP4, HP1, TP9, TP3** **To facilitate development in and around central Ashford and improve choice of transport mode**	**2010**
Ashford A28 Western Spine Road	**SS1, AS1, HP1, EP2** **To facilitate development in and around central Ashford**	**2010**
Ashford: Major ring road modifications	**SS1, AS1, EP2, HP1, TP9** **To facilitate development in and around central Ashford**	**2006**
Ashford: Park and Ride sites	**SS1, AS1, EP4, HP1, TP3, TP9, TP10** **To facilitate development in and around central Ashford and improve choice of transport mode**	**2007/08**
Queenborough: Rushenden Link to A249	**SS1, SW1, HP1, EP2, EP4** **To help regenerate Queenborough and Rushenden**	**2006**
Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road (between East Hall Farm and the A2)	**SS1, SW1**	**2011 - 2016**
OTHER SCHEMES #		
A260 Hawkinge Bypass (completion)	**SS1, SH1, HP1** **To facilitate completion of the strategic expansion of Hawkinge**	**2005**
B2163/A274 Leeds/Langley Bypass	**QL6, QL11** **To provide high standard link**	**2009/10**

	between M20/A20 and the south of Maidstone and bypass sensitive villages	
A227(A25) Borough Green and Platt Bypass	**QL12** **To reduce traffic in Borough Green and St. Mary's Platt on the A227 and A25**	**2007**
A228 East Bank of the Medway/Snodland Bypass Dualling	**TM1, HP1** **To facilitate the proposed development of Peters Pit, on the East Bank of the Medway for housing and associated social and community facilities**	**2011-2016**
A228/A26 Kings Hill – Seven Mile Lane	**TM1, HP1** **To complete the improvement of the A228 Primary Route between the M20 and A26**	**2011 - 2016**
A229 Maidstone: Upper Stone Street Improvements and All Saints Link Road	**SS1, MA1, QL3, QL6,QL12,TP9** **To improve traffic flows in the centre of Maidstone and to improve the environment and safety of the historic area around the Archbishop's Palace and residential areas south of the town centre**	**2011 - 2016**
A26 Tonbridge: London Road – Hadlow Road Link	**QL3, QL6, QL12** **To improve traffic flows in Tonbridge and relieve the historic High Street and Bordyke areas.**	**2011 - 2016**
Improved Links between Hempstead and Walderslade	**SS1, ME1, TP9** **To improve public transport linkage between existing communities, with no increased highway capacity**	**2011-2016**

 # Schemes may be funded partially or fully by development

Policy TP9: Supporting Public Transport

Public transport will be promoted by providing through partnership:

- **better interchange facilities between public transport and other transport modes, including better car parking;**
- **better integration between bus and rail services, including through ticketing;**
- **the provision of improved and integrated public transport information;**
- **improved facilities for passengers, especially access for the mobility impaired;**
- **continued financial support for non-commercial but socially necessary bus services;**
- **procuring Government grant for urban and rural services;**
- **greater use of bus priority measures;**
- **encouraging the improvement of the rail network and services using Government funding streams and developer contributions;**
- **the development of quality partnerships, such as those already in Maidstone and Thanet, and in other areas such as Canterbury.**

Table TP9

The following specific schemes to improve public transport services are envisaged:
• **refurbishment of Greenhithe Station including public transport interchange;** • **redevelopment of Maidstone East station and interchange improvements, including pedestrian links to Maidstone Barracks Station (1);** • **reconstruction of Strood station and interchange improvements (1);** • **enhanced bus/rail interchange at Gillingham, Tonbridge and Gravesend;** • **A20 corridor: Medway Gap: bus priority measures (1);** • **improved rail interchange facilities at Ashford Station and in south Ashford;** • **consolidated bus hub in central Ashford;** • **access, parking and interchange improvements: West Malling station (1);** • **Kent International (Manston) Airport : Parkway Station ;** • **rail service and infrastructure improvements on the Medway Valley Line;** • **enhanced pedestrian facilities for Chatham station;** • **enhanced access arrangements to Rochester station (1);** • **integration and improvement at Dover Priory Station.**

Notes:

(1) Scheme to be funded wholly or partially by development

Policy TP10: Supporting Park and Ride

Bus and rail based Park & Ride facilities to serve both town centres and major traffic generators will be supported where they form part of an overall transport strategy for an area, including reduced parking in town centres, increased parking charges and bus priority measures linking the facilities to the town centre. Where appropriate contributions towards the provision of such facilities will be sought from developers.

Policy TP11: Facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists

Facilities for pedestrians and cyclists will be provided and their use promoted. Local authorities should ensure that these are included in the design of all transport projects and other developments. Land should be safeguarded to provide safe and direct pedestrian and cycle routes where necessary.

Policy TP12: Development and Access to the Primary/Secondary Road Network

Development will not be permitted which involves either the construction of a new access onto the local transport authorities' primary or secondary road network or the increased use of an existing access, where a significantly increased risk of crashes or traffic delays would result, unless appropriate measures to mitigate the effect of development have been secured. No new accesses onto the Highways Agency's motorway or high quality dual carriageway trunk road network will be permitted.

Before proposals for development are permitted, the local planning authority will need to be satisfied that any necessary transport infrastructure, the need for which arises wholly or substantially from the development, are in place or certain to be provided.

Policy TP13: Rail Freight and Handling Facilities

Development which will encourage the transfer of freight from road to rail, including the development of freight handling facilities, will be permitted unless there is overriding conflict with other planning and environmental considerations. If necessary, conditions will be imposed on planning permissions in order to maximise the amount of non-road borne freight movements.

Policy TP14: Safeguarding of Railway Land for Transport Purposes

Land used formerly for the railways will be safeguarded from development which would preclude its future use to meet an identified transport need.

Policy TP15: Development Traffic & Heavy Goods Vehicles

Development which generates significant increases in traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles, will not be permitted if it is not well related to the primary and secondary road network, or if it would result in a significant increased risk of crashes or traffic delays unless appropriate measures to mitigate the effect of the development have been secured.

Kent County Council and Medway Council will:

- **identify and signpost lorry routes so as to direct heavy goods vehicles away from rural and residential areas;**
- **work with others to achieve distribution of goods by sustainable means in the urban areas in Kent.**

Policy TP16: Local Transport Strategies

Local transport strategies for urban and rural areas will be promoted in accordance with the transport policies of this Plan and the Local Transport Plans for Kent and Medway. The prioritisation of investment in urban areas will have regard to the regional hubs and interchanges identified in the Regional Transport Strategy.

Policy TP17*:* Traffic and Management of Minor Roads

Through traffic, particularly goods vehicles, will be discouraged from travelling on minor roads by the use of traffic management measures, regulatory measures, the control of development and freight quality partnerships.

Minor roads will not be widened or realigned unless overriding safety considerations require it and no alternative method to resolve the safety problems is deemed practicable.

Policy TP18: Roadside Services

New facilities and services for road users and development of existing facilities will be permitted on the motorway, trunk road and primary route network where a need is established and where there is no overriding conflict with other planning and environmental considerations.

Policy TP19: Vehicle Parking Standards

Development proposals should comply with the respective vehicle parking policies and maximum standards adopted by Kent County Council and Medway Council. Where agreed with the Local Transport Authority, more stringent standards maybe applied in Local Development Documents.

Policy TP20: Gateway Function of the Ports

The role of the following ports as deep water and/ or gateways to Europe will be protected and enhanced:

- **Dover**
- **Channel Tunnel**
- **Medway Ports, including Sheerness and Thamesport**
- **Ramsgate.**

At the 'core' ports of Dover, Sheerness, Thamesport and Ramsgate, the priority will be to safeguard the port function.

Proposals for development which will enable the growth of trade at Kent and Medway ports and wharves will be supported provided that:

- **any measures required by the development to improve local access by road and rail are brought forward as part of the proposals;**
- **the proposals maximise the potential for passenger and freight traffic to be accommodated by rail;**
- **the proposals achieve a high standard of design; and**
- **there are no overriding adverse economic, social and environmental impacts.**

Deep water frontage in the Thames Estuary will be safeguarded for port or port related uses where good surface access by road, and preferably by rail, exists or can be readily provided. Elsewhere proposals which will assist the diversification of trade, port operations or land uses will normally be supported.

Policy TP21: Channel Tunnel Capacity and Second Fixed Link

Improvements to the capacity of the Channel Tunnel and to the loading gauge and capacity of the Channel Tunnel rail routes will be supported.

In the event of a second fixed cross-Channel link being proposed, the local planning authorities will consider the economic, transport, social and environmental impacts of such a proposal. A proposal that substantially increases congestion on the County's road network will not be supported.

Policy TP22: Kent Ports

- **Development of the Port of Dover will be supported to enable growth of freight and passenger traffic. Any such development, outside of the existing harbour walls, will be subject to the reinstatement of the rail link to the Western Docks to enable a significant proportion of freight to reach the port by rail. Improvements to the loading gauge between Dover Docks and Folkestone will be supported;**

- **At Thamesport further expansion of the port will be encouraged within existing port confines and through inland expansion at Grain subject to improvements to the capacity of the rail access to the port and improvements to the A228;**

- **At the Port of Sheerness expansion should involve intensification of port use within existing port confines or expansion onto nearby land designated for commercial use. Development that further expands the port will be subject to the availability of, and opportunity for, improved transhipment and rail access and the completion of the A249 Second Swale Crossing scheme;**

- **At the Port of Ramsgate proposals should assist the growth of port trade and not compromise its role as a major gateway port. However within the area of the Royal Harbour, diversification will be supported subject to the overriding need to protect the historic character of the area;**

- **At the Port of Folkestone, mixed use development which will assist in the regeneration of central Folkestone will be supported. This could include leisure and business uses as well as some retention of port and fishing activities; and**

- **On the Thames and Medway in North Kent, key deep water wharves will be retained and a programme of investment in modern facilities, rail access and good highway linkages will be pursued. A programme of rationalisation and restructuring of the wharves will be carried forward as part of the Thames Gateway initiative.**

Policy TP23: Major Distribution and Transhipment Centres

Proposals which encourage the transfer of freight from road to rail, between road and air or between road and sea or river, which are designed and landscaped to a high standard, will be supported. This will include the following locations:

- **on the Isle of Sheppey (Sheerness) subject to the completion of the A249 second Swale crossing;**
- **north of Sittingbourne (Ridham and Kemsley area);**
- **serving Thamesport on the Isle of Grain, subject to improvements to the A228 and rail access;**
- **at Dover on allocated employment land to provide inland freight facilities for the port;**

- **at Dover through extension of the Dover Western Docks to provide a road-rail freight interchange, subject to economic and environmental considerations;**
- **at Kent International (Manston) Airport subject to Policy TP24.**

The provision of an inland inter modal interchange to serve the Channel Tunnel, or a major new distribution and transhipment centre elsewhere in Kent, will be permitted only where:

- **the site is easily accessible to the trunk road system and served by rail sidings and/or water;**
- **strong evidence is provided that the proposal is necessary and viable, and will not have any significant adverse impact on the local highway network;**
- **there are no significant adverse effects on the local economy, countryside character or the environment, including the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

The long-term use of the rail facility, as an integral part of the operation of the site, should be secured.

Policy TP24: Kent International (Manston) Airport

The development of Kent International (Manston) Airport into a regional airport with a capacity of up to 6 million passengers per annum by 2021 will be supported. Proposals related to the development of the airport will be assessed for acceptability against the following criteria:

- **development being directly related to the operation of the airport unless otherwise forming part of a proposal in a Local Development Document; and**
- **no material harm on internationally or nationally designated environmental areas; and**
- **no significant detrimental impact on locally designated environmental areas; and**

- **no significant adverse impact on the amenity of local communities which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and**
- **appropriate measures being secured to mitigate, and where appropriate compensate for, the impact of development including noise control, air pollution, light pollution, water pollution, sewerage disposal, landscape, species and habitat management; and**
- **the requirements for surface access being adequately accommodated within the capacity of the existing or committed local transport network; and**
- **measures being identified and secured to improve access by public transport modes including the provision of a direct rail link when the flow through the airport reaches three million passengers per annum.**

Policy TP25: Lydd Airport

The expansion of aviation at Lydd Airport will be supported. Proposals related to the development of the airport will be assessed for acceptability against the following criteria:

- **development being directly related to the operation of the airport unless otherwise forming part of a proposal in a Local Development Document; and**
- **no material harm on internationally or nationally designated environmental areas; and**
- **no significant detrimental impact on locally designated environmental areas; and**
- **no significant adverse impact on the amenity of local communities which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and**
- **appropriate measures being secured to mitigate, and where appropriate compensate for, the impact of development including noise control, air pollution, light pollution, water pollution, sewerage disposal, landscape, species and habitat management; and**
- **the requirements for surface access being adequately accommodated within the capacity of the existing or committed local transport network; and**
- **measures being identified and secured to improve access by public transport modes.**

Policy TP26: Other Airports and Airfields

Proposals for the development of new facilities for commercial and recreational flying at existing airfields will be permitted only where they do not have an unacceptable adverse social and environmental impact on local communities and where there is a positive impact on the local and wider economy.

Rochester Airport will be safeguarded against development, which would prejudice its operation for general and business aviation.

Chapter 9; Managing Our Natural Resources : *Climate Change- Energy Production- Water Resources – Flood Risk*

Policy NR1: Development and the Prudent Use of Resources

Proposals for development should incorporate sustainable construction techniques and demonstrate that their design and layout contributes to:

(a) the conservation and prudent use of energy, water and other natural resources, including provision for recycling facilities, water conservation and energy efficiency; and

(b) a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through re-use, or the more efficient use, of resources.

Policy NR2: Energy Generation

Proposals for energy generation will be assessed by the local planning authorities in terms of:

- **their impact on landscape and nature conservation, health, built environment, air quality, atmosphere (including the level of emissions) and water resource interests; and**
- **the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures; and**
- **the proximity of proposals to the energy source and their contribution to meeting the energy needs of local communities; and**
- **the prospective life of energy plants and, where appropriate, the site restoration measures proposed.**

Policy NR3: Renewable and Sustainable Energy Production

Development necessary for the production of energy from renewable sources will be supported where there would be no overriding conflict with environmental interests and Local Development Documents will include criteria for their location.

Provision of renewable and sustainable energy production as an integral component of new development and in small-scale and community projects will be supported. Local Development Documents will include renewable energy production targets in support of sub regional targets for individual energy sources, and will identify sites for renewable and sustainable energy facilities where viable proposals have been put forward.

Policy NR4: Combined Heat and Power Generation

Proposals for combined heat and power generation and district heating systems will be supported particularly where they are based on the harnessing of renewable energy sources and can be integrated with new development. Local Development Documents should assess, and where viable, provide for such schemes in the planning of major development proposals.

Policy NR5: Pollution Impacts

The quality of Kent's environment will be conserved and enhanced. This will include the visual, ecological, geological, historic and water environments, air quality, noise and levels of tranquillity and light intrusion.

Development should be planned and designed to avoid, or adequately mitigate, pollution impacts. Proposals likely to have adverse implications for pollution should be the subject of a pollution impact assessment.

In assessing proposals local authorities will take into account:
a) impact on prevailing background pollution levels; and
b) the cumulative impacts of proposals on pollution levels; and
c) the ability to mitigate adverse pollution impacts; and
d) the extent and potential extremes of any impacts on air quality, water resources, biodiversity and human health.

Development which would result in, or significantly contribute to, unacceptable levels of pollution, will not be permitted.

Policy NR6*:* Development Sensitive to Pollution

Development which would be sensitive to adverse levels of noise, air, light and other pollution, will not be supported where such conditions exist, or are in prospect, and where mitigation measures would not afford satisfactory protection.

Policy NR7*:* Air Quality Management Areas

The local authorities are required to:
(a) review and assess air quality and, where necessary, declare Air Quality Management Areas;
(b) work towards improving air quality in Air Quality Management Areas through preparation of an Air Quality Action Plan.

The scale and character of development in, or adjoining such areas, should be controlled so as not to adversely affect this improvement.

Policy NR8*:* Water Quality

Development will not be permitted where it would give rise to an unacceptable impact on the quality or yield of Kent's watercourses, coastal waters and/or ground water resources.

Policy NR9*:* Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment

The development of new or expansion of water supply or wastewater facilities will be required and supported where:
- **there is a demonstrable need to serve existing development and/or development proposed in accordance with the development plan; and**
- **this represents the best environmental option; and**
- **land use and environmental impacts are minimised through appropriate mitigation.**

Land required for expanded or new facilities for water resource management or wastewater treatment will be identified and safeguarded in Local Development Documents. This will include provision for the enlargement of Bewl reservoir and additional wastewater treatment facilities in the Ashford area.

Policy NR10*:* Development and Flood Risk

Development will be planned to avoid the risk of flooding and will not be permitted:
(i) if it would be subject to an unacceptable risk of flooding or where it would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere;
(ii) where it would prejudice the capacity and integrity of flood plains or planned flood protection or coastal defence measures;

(iii) where it will hinder the implementation of future flood protection or coastal defence measures;
(iv) if it would adversely affect the ability of the land to drain.

Where development is necessary in areas at risk of flooding it should be designed and controlled to mitigate the impact of flood risk.

Local Development Documents will include policies to:

(a) ensure that a risk based sequential approach, reflecting degrees of flood risk, is adopted in guiding specified categories of development away from flood risk areas;
(b) secure the provision and maintenance of appropriate drainage systems in new developments to mitigate flood risk;
(b) ensure that proposals for development are accompanied by flood risk assessments appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and the risk;
(c) Seek to create new or improve existing wetland wildlife habitats where these complement flood risk reduction measures.

<u>Policy NR11*:* Flood Protection</u>

The development of new or replacement flood protection or coastal defence measures that are in accordance with a Catchment Management Plan, Shoreline Management Plans or Coastal Defence Strategies will be supported. Where these are required to service a development their provision and maintenance should be funded as part of that development.

Chapter 10: Managing Our Waste and Mineral Resources

Policy WM1: Integrated Waste Management

Provision will be made for the integrated management of waste reflecting the principles of Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO), the national waste hierarchy and national and regional targets for waste management.

Waste or Local Development Documents will identify the range, scale and location of facilities to provide for rapid growth in capacity for recycling, composting and recovery from waste of all controlled streams in Kent.

Energy from waste proposals will be considered only as part of an integrated approach to increase waste recovery rates and should incorporate other waste management facilities including recycling, composting and materials recovery.

Wherever practicable facilities should be located to enable the use of rail and/or water based transport.

Policy WM2: Assessment Criteria for Waste Proposals

Proposals for the treatment, storage, transfer, processing or disposal of waste will be required to show that they represent the best balance between the most efficient and most environmentally sustainable method of managing a specific type of waste.

Proposals should demonstrate that they:

- **meet a demonstrable need that overrides material agricultural, landscape, conservation, traffic and other environmental or land use concerns; and**

- **reflect the principles of the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) and thereby accord with the waste hierarchy, the proximity principle (taking into account the environmental impact of the mode of transport proposed) and the contribution made to self sufficiency.**

Small scale composting facilities within the Metropolitan Green Belt will be supported where these criteria are fulfilled, where a local need is met, and where they can be accommodated without severe impact on the purposes of the Green Belt.

Policy WM3: Securing Waste Reduction

Development proposals will be required to demonstrate they are able to make a contribution to reducing growth in the volume of waste generated in Kent.

Local Development Documents will include policies:

1) **requiring the submission of a waste minimisation and recycling plan alongside major development proposals and, where appropriate, provide for the use of conditions or agreements to secure waste minimisation;**

2) **providing for the development of manufacturing or processing facilities to recycle and/or recover waste.**

Policy WM4: Planning for Waste Management Capacity

Waste or Local Development Frameworks in Kent will make provision for, and maintain, integrated waste management capacity sufficient for 15 years ahead.

Through their Waste or Local Development Frameworks, Kent and Medway Councils will each make provision for the management of the equivalent of the waste arising in their areas.

Policy WM5: Waste Disposal to Land

Where disposal of waste to land can be demonstrated to represent the Best Practicable Environmental Option in terms of Policy WM1:

1) **For inert waste, priority will be given to using suitable mineral workings rather than other land disposal sites where this will facilitate the reinstatement of land to a beneficial after-use and/or secure improvement of the environment;**
2) **For non inert waste, subject to Policy WM2, Kent and Medway Councils will consider landraising as an option for waste disposal. Provision should be made for the re-instatement of land to a beneficial after-use.**

Policy WM6: Assessment of Strategic Waste Management Facilities

Waste or Local Development Frameworks in Kent will assess a pattern of waste management facilities over the plan period that will include consideration of:

(i) strategic recycling facilities;
(ii) industrial scale composting facilities;
(iii) waste reprocessing plant providing energy production both for the plant and wider use and incorporating provision for materials recycling;
(iv) further landfill capacity to meet the need to dispose of residues to land; and
(v) other facilities that may be required to meet integrated waste management targets.

They will also determine the need for, and pattern of, small scale waste processing and composting facilities.

Policy WM7: Construction Related Spoil

In order to minimise the environmental impact of construction projects which require significant quantities of construction aggregates or give rise to significant amounts of surplus spoil, a scheme for the transport and routing of such materials, together with proposals for the disposal or reuse of surplus spoil, will be designed into the project itself.

Policy MN1: Sources of Minerals Supply

Subject to environment, transport and other material planning considerations, including appropriate after-use, proposals for the provision of minerals through recycling, the use of secondary materials, facilitation of imports and the acceptable extraction of local sources of supply will be permitted.

Policy MN2: Use of Secondary/Recycled Materials

Kent County Council and Medway Council will seek to maximise the use of recycled and secondary materials through:

- **the Councils' own material specifications in setting contracts;**
- **encouraging other contractors to use, and specify the use of, recycled materials; and**
- **permitting recycling proposals at appropriate locations consistent with Waste or Local Development Documents.**

Policy MN3: Assessment Criteria for Minerals Proposals

Proposals for minerals extraction and/or associated plant and buildings and minerals recycling facilities will be permitted only where they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on agricultural, landscape, conservation or environmental interests of acknowledged importance, or on residential and business communities.

Permission will only be granted if any physical constraints on the land have been properly taken into account and if there are adequate access proposals, measures to minimise harm to the landscape and environment, to protect local communities, to landscape the site, remove plant or buildings after workings have ceased and to restore the land to an appropriate after use, normally as working progresses.

Wherever appropriate a period of aftercare will also be required.

Policy MN4: Provision and Safeguarding of Marine Wharves and Rail Depots

Existing marine wharves and rail depots that receive and process minerals will be protected generally from development that would inhibit their continued operation or potential expansion. This will be achieved through the identification of buffer zones around such sites in Minerals or Local Development Documents.

Wharves on the Thames and Medway will be subject of study and potential rationalisation in accordance with Policy TP22.

Proposals for new marine wharves and rail depots, to receive and process imports of minerals, will be permitted on appropriate sites. In assessing whether a site is appropriate, Kent County Council and Medway Council will consider all material planning interests including those relating to agriculture, landscape, conservation, environment, traffic and access.

Policy MN5: Provision for Construction Aggregates

Kent County Council and Medway Council will review and maintain:

1) **a supply of aggregates sufficient to contribute to national, regional and local needs, in accordance with their agreed share of regional aggregates supply.**
2) **a landbank of permitted reserves of (i) sand and gravel and (ii) ragstone throughout the period of the Plan sufficient for at least 7 years at agreed apportionment levels.**

Policy MN6: Limestone Extraction in East Kent

Subject to the requirements of Policies MN1 and MN3, Kent County Council will give favourable consideration to limestone mining in East Kent. When assessing the landbank for Kent's land won construction aggregate requirements, no account will be taken of this option until planning permission has been granted.

Policy MN7: Silica Sand

Kent County Council will seek to maintain a landbank of permitted reserves of silica sand sufficient for at least 10 years supply for each production site, or at least 15 years at sites where significant capital investment is required.

Policy MN8: Building Stone

Kent County Council and Medway Council will seek to ensure that there is an adequate supply of building stone available for the repair of local buildings of architectural and historic importance.

Policy MN9: Brickearth

Proposals for the extraction of brickearth will be permitted which will enable each stockbrick works to be maintained with at least 15 years reserves of brickearth. Proposals for brickearth extraction on the best and most versatile agricultural land must provide for the site to be progressively restored.

Policy MN10: Chalk and Clay

Kent County Council and Medway Council will seek to maintain throughout the Plan period:

a) at least 25 years of permitted reserves of chalk and clay for cement production;
b) at least 15 years of permitted reserves of clay for brick and tile production;
c) at least 10 years of permitted reserves of chalk for agricultural uses;
d) adequate permitted reserves of chalk and clay for engineering, pharmaceutical and whiting manufacture.

Policy MN11: Oil, Gas and Coalbed Methane

Proposals for the exploration and appraisal of oil, natural gas and coalbed methane will be permitted. Permission for any production of on-shore oil, gas and coalbed methane which would require a gathering station, export terminal or distribution network will only be given if there are adequate proposals for:

a) the screening, landscaping and design of production well sites, gathering stations and export terminals; and
b) access and routing for vehicular traffic; and
c) avoiding nuisance to any sensitive development in the vicinity; and
d) transport of oil, gas and coalbed methane within the plan area (for which there will be a presumption in favour of rail transport and/or underground pipelines so far as this is practicable); and
e) the testing or disposal of gas; and
f) the clearance of plant, equipment and buildings and the restoration and aftercare of all areas affected by the production operations at the end of the permitted period.

The siting of gathering stations and export terminals in locations protected by the Structure Plan's countryside and coast policies, or in locations close to substantial built development, will be refused, unless it can be shown that there is no suitable alternative location.

Policy MN12: Safeguarding of Strategically Important Minerals

Development proposals which would sterilise the future availability of strategic minerals identified and safeguarded in Minerals or Local Development Documents will be refused.

Where possible, known sources of secondary and recycled materials will be safeguarded from sterilisation.

Where development is necessary, extraction of the mineral resource prior to, or in conjunction with, development will be encouraged.

Wherever practicable, proposals for development should provide for the use of secondary and recycled materials.

Chapter 11: Implementing the Structure Plan and Monitoring its Effectiveness

Policy IM1: Meeting the Costs of Community and Other Infrastructure Needs Generated by New Development

The local planning authorities will require appropriate and proportionate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development. Such contributions will be agreed before planning permission is granted and the facilities and/or services will be provided in accordance with an agreed phasing programme and, where appropriate, ongoing management and/or maintenance arrangements.